A

SURVEY

Of the Insolent and Infamous

LIBEL,

ENTITULED,

NAPHTALI, &c.

Wherein several things, falling in debate in these times are considered; and some Doctrines in *Lex Rex* and the *Apolog. Narration* (called by this Author *Martyrs*) are brought to the touch-stone.

PART I.

Representing the dreadful aspect of *Naphtali*'s Principles upon the powers ordained by God, and detecting the horrid consequences in practice necessarily resulting from such Principles, if owned and received by people.

Job 13. 7. 9. 11.

Will you speak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for him? Is it good that he should search you out? or as one man mocketh another, do ye so mock him? Shall not his excellency make you afraid, and his dread fall upon you?

Psal. 144. 10.

It is he that giveth Salvation unto Kings, who delivereth David *his servant from the hurtful sword.*

Prov. 24. 21, 22.

My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change: For their calamity shall rise suddenly, and who knoweth the ruine of them both?

Printed, Anno Dom. M. DC. LXVIII.

THE PREFACE.

IT hath been, and is the lot of the Lord's Militant-Church, to be toſſed with manifold tempeſts, and to be (as it were) grinded betwixt the two mill-ſtones of a profeſſedly profane and atheiſtical world, and of a party pretenaing highly for Truth and Piety, hanging out the Flag of the faireſt Profeſsion for both; whiles both are really undermined and fought againſt. Such are the deſtroying methods of that ghoſtly enemy of mens Souls, that not ſucceeding in his work of peſtering the Church by profaneneſs, (theſe who have received the truth in love, and have it intimately ingrafted in their hearts, abhorring that way; yea, ſuch as have but the literal knowledge of the Goſpel, being thereby moved to abſtain from, and led to eſcape the groſs pollutions that are in the world) He takes another courſe, debauching ſome cleanly-like inſtruments under fair forms of godlineſs, without the power of it, to promote the efficacy of his deceit upon well-meaning people, enſnaring them (by their means) into erroneous Doctrines, or impious and ſcandalous Practices. As the former ages of the Church of Chriſt, have abounded in experiences of this kind; So alſo, ſince the light of the bleſſed Reformation (after a long and dark night) did break up, the enemy hath ſtudiouſly ſowed his tares while the good grain was in ſowing, and in deep deceitfulneſs accommodating his tentations to the courſe then begun and carried on, would put in to be a Reformer, and did yoke in his lightſome-like and well-dreſſed Agents to be (with others) purgers and builders of the Church of God. By theſe men, walking under moſt ſpecious

colours of great humility, fervent zeal, ſincere devotion, real mortification and ſelf-denyal, (graces, where they are in truth, never ſufficiently valued) he did inſinuate himſelf into, and poſſeſs himſelf of the mindes of the ſimple, apt to believe every thing, and led them away captive into moſt dangerous errors and damnable practices: So that in the event, theſe ſhining glorious-like purgers and builders of the Temple of God, proved dreadful defilers and deſtroyers thereof. This moved the heroick Worthies employedby God to waſte and pull down the Kingdom of Anti-chriſt, to turn their golden and mighty pens againſt that glittering ſeed of the Serpent, theſe celeſtial Prophets (as they were then termed) who by over-doing, were undoing the work of God in their hands; and who, under pretence of further and through Reformation (as they called it) did really hinder the courſe of the Goſpel. What wreſtlings the eminent Servants of God, Luther (who was by them accounted a little leſs Antichriſt then the Roman, and who dyed an heart-broken man becauſe of them) Zwinglius, Melanchton, Calvin, Bucer, Bullinger and many others, had with this ſort of men, their own Writings, and the Hiſtories of that time can teſtifie. We ſpeak of the Sect of the Anabaptiſts, (ſo called from their moſt common, but not from their greateſt errors) a Sect which under much toleration, becauſe of the ſeeming harmleſneſs and holineſs of its favourers, grew to that ſtrength in Germany, Switzerland and other parts, that it became formidable to the States and Countreys where it had place, and which at laſt (letting the maſk fall off) did break forth fearfully in groſs voluptuouſneſs, tumults, rapines, horrid murthers, blood-ſhed and rebellions againſt lawful Magiſtrates and Princes, (whom they thought they were called of God to root out, as being the ungodly of the world) And in theſe tumults, confuſions and rebellions, there periſhed above one hundred thouſand men. The contagion of this way hath, leſs or more, ſpread it ſelf to ſome other reformed Churches; and lately did come to ſome ſtrength in Britain: A thing which was juſtly feared,

and

and wisely foreseen, by men of great gravity, judgement and wisdom in our Neighbour Land, near one hundred years ago; who expressed in their Writings, their jealousies and fears, that England *might be taken and tainted with the infection of that evil. These godly, sage and sagacious persons, were neither so transported with passion, nor so void of charity, as to impute the direct intention of bringing in the errors of that way, unto those who were contrary minded to them in the matters of Church-discipline. But, when they seriously considered the tendency and consequence of some of their Principles who were vehement for the form of Discipline, which they desired to obtrude upon that Church, and the conformity of some of their Practices to the way of the Sect of the* Anabaptists *in other Countries; they did, upon too good ground, fear the breaking out of that evil, which we in our dayes have seen come to pass in a very high measure: And, who knows where it shall sist? It is a thing too too evident, that under sundry external forms of Government, that mystery of iniquity worketh to the confusion of humane Societies, to the bringing of divine Ordinances into contempt, and to the introducing of Libertinism, Quakerism, Rantism and Atheism. That Chamelion-like and various Sect, can shroud it self under divers external forms of Church-government. If it be true that Dr.* Ames. *saith,* Fresh Sute, p. 93. *the* Anabaptists *in* Zealand *and* Friesland *have their own Bishops: in the Congregational and Independent way, there are many of that stamp; nor is the* Presbyterian *way so priviledged, but that under the lap thereof, men of that furious spirit do lurk.*

Dr. Whitgift and Mr. Hookers

It is not intended by any thing that shall be said of the naughty courses of others, to cast any blot upon those who are deemed the moderate men of that way. Only it must be said, that they would do themselves a great deal of right, if the concerns of Gods glory, and the honour of his reformed Churches, the compassion due to Souls seduced, and ready to be seduced, and the true interest of their own Reputation might pre-

vail

vail with them, by some evidence of a publick deed to disclaim and damn the scandalous and shameful Doctrines and Practices, whereby evil men strive to support the Presbytery. Otherwise, what marvel is it, that they be looked upon in the esteem of these who value them as involved in the guilty connivance and consent to all the vile things that issue from Napht. and his party? And that this Libeller be looked upon as the common allowed Advocate of the Presbytery, and who reads the Book, will with some ground say, crimine ab uno disce omnes. Neither is it our design or will, to grieve or give offence to the generation of the humble, meek and self-denyed seekers of Gods face, partakers with us of the same pretious faith, and running to obtain the same prize of the inheritance with us, (however differing in judgement in some particulars) nor shall we take them as partakers with this furious Author and his adherents. For who can imagine, that a meek people, who hath the promise of Gods teaching, should be so far transported, as to take the circumstantials of Religion, for the great and weighty matters of the Law and Gospel, without which known and believed, none can come to God? Who can think, that an intelligent people should account, that the concerns of Christs Kingdom and their own salvation, doth lye with so much stresse upon this point, that the weakest and most ignorant Minister shall have a potestative parity with the man of greatest Gifts, Learning and Knowledge; that the Minister weakest in his Prudentials, should have equal Authority in mannaging the matters of Gods house, with the wisest and one of the most noted prudence; that the youngest, rawest, most unexperienced Minister, should have as much power in ruling the house of God, as the man fullest of years, whose judgement is consolidated and ripened for Government, and who hath for a long time given such documents of good and wise behaviour, that makes him fitter to rule the younger sort, then to be ruled by them? Or, who can see the prejudice to Christs Kingdom and pretious souls, if such a worthy person (as is described) be intrusted with an inspection over other Brethren

and

and Churches in a reasonable bounds, not with a dominative or lordly power, but paternal and fatherly; not to do after his own arbitrement, and as one unchallengeable in his actions, but to be regulated by acts of the Church and Land, and to be responsible to his Superiors in case of maleversation; not to rule solly, but with the consent and counsel of Presbyters? Can this way be disrellished by sober Christians, being so strongly pleaded by the light of sound reason, making so much for the comliness and order of Christs Church, being so suitable and correspondent to the antient Government of the Church of Israel (*where there were Priests and chief Priests, and several ranks of Ministers, an order which was neither typical nor temporal, but hath a standing reason reaching us*) *being so conform to the beginnings of Christs ordering the New-testament Ministry (where there were Apostles above the seventy Disciples*) *being so agreeable to the Apostles constitution of the Government of the Churches of the New Testament, which was in an imparity of Power in Ministers, (as is luculently exemplified in the Power of* Timothy *and* Titus, *who were no Evangelists, nor ever accounted so by the Spirit of God) And finally, our ascended glorious Saviour, having honoured persons invested with that precedency by Letters written by his Secretary* John *unto them,* Rev. 2. 3. *chap. wherein he shews the approbation of their office and power, reproving their neglects, yet honouring them with the stile of Angels to the Churches, or his Messengers in special manner.* To the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus, &c. which cannot without notable perversion of the Scripture be otherwise understood, but of single persons presiding over Presbyters. And this order Christs Church and dear Spouse, having since that time retained in all places, where Churches were constitute without exception, in all times without interruption, untill this last Age, wherein through hatred of corruptions adhering thereto under Popery, and because of the enimity of the popish Bishops to the Reformation, some have utterly, without any reason, rejected the office it self. Who can think, that a Christian people will not readily follow*

the

the foot-steps of the flock in former generations? Neither is there any intention to provoke any fearers of God, who have been perhaps in an hour of tentation miscarried to irregular courses, following too readily in the simplicity of their hearts cunning leaders, who have had too much dominion over their faith; these we judge worthy of greatest tenderness in dealing with them: nor are we without hope, that God who stills the noise of the seas, the noise of the waves, and the tumult of the people, Ps. 65. v. 7. *will in time allay their animosities and rebuke the stormy wind and seas of their passions, that they may be still, and that he will bring them to consider their wayes wherein they have exceeded, and give them to know how ill and bitter a thing it is to forsake their own mercies in the ordinances of God, for the want or having of this or that form of external Government. But these we aim at in this parallel with Anabaptists, are the Naphtalian party, i. e. the furious sort of these, who under the conduct of this teacher and his like, make sport of rebellions, murders, assassinations, that have so hardened and harnessed their hearts (as appears by their writings and deeds) that they have become stout in a dedolent greediness to commit any wickedness, which they account meet to serve their design, as if their supposed good cause could legittimat the worst course, who make no reckoning, as their Doctor here professes, of overturning Thrones, making the Land drunk with the blood of the Inhabitants, multiplying fatherlesse and widows in the midst thereof, and introducing greatest confusions and calamities, that may make all faces gather blackness, and all to smite on the thigh, crying*, alas for the day! *if so be, they may upon the ruins of all, erect the idol of pretended parity of Ministers; which when they have set up, the imperious agitators will, (as they have done formerly) baffle, if any offer be to level them to others, and howsoever the weaker brethren must be entertained with fair words, and noddified with notional disputes anent their parity with the best, that they may think themselves somewhat: yet, how disdainfully was it, and yet would be taken*

if

if these low shrubs should essay a practical parity with the tall Cedars in the Government of affairs. Imparity was then without a title, now it is with it, and there is our change and great defection; and surely that which hath been, will be, and there is no new thing under the Sun.

This furious Napht. *coming in upon the back of the* Apology, *as another invenomed Egg, hatched (be-like) by one and the same Cockatrice; the second justifying the rebellion to which the first did instigate, and inflaming to more, may let them, who will not shut their own eyes, see the mystery of Anabaptistical confusion, working and spreading: for, although the Author pretendeth highly for Presbytery, which he and his complices (Hawks of the right nest) have long ago hewed down in this Church, as to the practice of it: Yet, evident it is, that his pretences for Presbytery are but Prefaces to some further great design of mischief to the Church and State. For, having sold himself to work confusion and rebellion, he goes about to overthrow all the powers ordained of God in most cyclopick boldness, displaying a banner against all invested lawfully with any degree of Civil or Church power, bending his spirit to the uttermost, to renew and revive our confusions, and to bear people in hand, that grossest rebellion is religious duty and real godliness. And in managing his matters, the Author behaves not himself like* Naphtali, (the hinde let loose, which giveth goodly words, *or* words of goodliness, fairness and pleasantness, *as*, Gen. 49. 21. *it is said of* Naphtali; *who therefore* is satisfied with favour, and full of the blessing of the Lord, *Deut.* 33. 23.) *But, as in his heart there are evil treasures of wickedness; So, in his lips and pen there is a burning fire, he strives to enflame all with the rage of his tongue, and runs upon all sorts of Authorities from the highest to the lowest, like a savage Beast or wild Boare let loose to waste and confound miserably both the visible Kingdom of Christ in the Land, and the civil Kingdom thereof setled upon the best foundations; and that his Book might want nothing of the compleatness of an infam-*

ous Libel, he falls upon particular persons by name, to aspers their credit, the constant integrity of whose conversation, will easily stop his foul lying mouth in the consciences of Gods people who know them.

What to do anent this bundle of impudent lyes and falshoods, grosse slanders and revilings, was much doubted. Upon the one hand, it was thought best to neglect the rage of this man (if one that hath so much renounced humanity, as he is here seen to do, may be so termed) least by being noticed, he might think himself somewhat, especially least people (who as they affect, are ordinarily opinionated) might have too much matter to feed their humour, to furnish their light discourses, and to ensnare their souls, by representing to them the matters of this Libell (worthy to be buried in oblivion) they being too apt (whatever salvo might be added) to receive the poison without the antidote according to their prejudices. It seemed also a matter full of tediousness to a well composed heart, to enter into a fire of endless strife and continual reciprocation of altercations, wherein a man is not likely to find more truth then he hath already, (truth in the most important matters in the Book, having been of old fully vindicated by learned hands, and nothing now opposed, but old songs, chanted over and over again) although like enough to lose much of that charity and calm and composed temper of heart which he had before. What man is he, that knowing, how much more important work he hath upon his hand, for his own salvation, and honouring God in his station in the world, would willingly engage in endless contests with persons, whose idleness gives them too great opportunity of evil doing, and who having cast by the Lords work in building his Church, are too much set to do Sathans work in dissipating the same? It seemed honourable enough to decline this contention and strife, which is like the letting out of waters, in expectation that either the mans conscience (if it be not infinitely corrupted) may confute him in most of his assertions and slanders, or that his manifest unchristian dealing may help to open the eyes of such

he

he labours to delude, and bring them to abhorre his way, or that the really religious and righteous dealings of Church and State may more forcibly put him to silence then words or writings can. Sometimes keeping silence is seasonable, the man according to Gods own heart, would not suffer Shimei's *revilings to be repayed upon the head of that dead dog;* Hezekiah *discharged to answer a word to railing* Rabshakeh; Jeremiah *the Prophet contradicted by the false Prophet* Hananiah, *went his way and said nothing; the wise* Solomon *forbids to take heed to all words that are spoken and to answer a fool according to his follie. The Lord of Kings and Prophets, sometimes answered not his accusers a word. So it seemed fit to let alone an insolent and froward railer and mocker, and not to lavish out pretious time, which might be better bestowed, upon one that gives such visible evidences both of a reasonless and unchristian spirit, whose Libel may be reckoned amongst the things* quæ spreta exolescunt, *and worthy to be answered with nothing but* silence *and* contempt. *But upon the other hand, it seemed something hard, (especially in such a distempered time) to suffer an insolent person, in whose mouth is a rod of pride, to cast the truth down to the ground without controll, and to tread upon and triumph over a holy and righteous cause, and upon honourable persons of all ranks, engaged in the maintenance thereof in so abusive, despiteful and intolerable a way, and not give him any check. Not to put some stop to this furious driver, who again and again assaults this Church with vile lyes and reproaches, looked like the deserting and betraying of an honest and honourable cause, or like the hirelings seeing the wolf and flying and leaving the flock to be destroyed with delusion,* fugisti quia tacuisti. *There is an evil silence that leaves men in sin, as well as an evil speaking that leads men to sin; and we are not only to give an account* pro otioso verbo, *but* pro otioso silentio; *for, idle silence, when God and the publick necessity of the Church, or Society whereof we are members, calls for a valiant (not brutishly violent and forcible that way, such as this man pleads*

for) and rational contending for the truth. It is ſinful puſillanimity, and not warrandable prudence to ſee truth fall in the ſtreets and not lift it up. And verily, this man ſeems to be amongſt theſe, of whom Solomon *ſayes*, Prov. 26. 5. who muſt be anſwered, leaſt he ſeem wiſe in his own conceit; *and to be amongſt theſe*, Tit. 1. 10, 11. unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, ὡς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, whoſe mouths muſt be ſtopped, *that the gangræne of his words may not creep further to the conſumption and ſubverſion of Church and State.*

But the great difficulty, in dealing with this man of no fore-head, (or if he have any, it is of the hardeſt mettal) of little conſcience, but of infinite loquacity, and of a moſt unbridled tongue, which is a treaſure of all reviling language, (whereof he is exceedingly profuſe, in beſtowing it upon perſons of all ranks) The great difficulty (I ſay) in dealing with him was how to moderate and temper a ſtile of writing toward ſuch a one; Difficile eſt Satyram non ſcribere contra Satyrum: *for hardly can a man meet in any book with more bitter invectives againſt all Authorities and Dignities, appointed and approven by God, then are here to be found. All that have gone that path before him, ſeem but children in wickedneſs in compariſon of him. He deſerves to be in the firſt claſſe of theſe,* Jude 8. who deſpiſe Dominion, and ſpeak evil of Dignities. *Yet it muſt be confeſſed, that the man deſerves well (albeit beſide his intention) of all the Authorities civil and eccleſiaſtical in the Land, for while others do politickly keep in,* ſupprimit Orator quæ ruſticus edit inepte. *He hath plainly laid open the ſpirit of the faction, for which he is Advocate, and gives (as we will hear) fair warning to the King, that he muſt not expect impunity (if they can have their will,) and to all the Nobles and Magiſtrates, whoſe places and dignities, forfeited* (as he ſaith) *by them, private perſons, in a* Phineas-*like ſpirit, are allowed to poſſeſs, removing and taking order with them for great apoſtaſie and patroniſing abominations (as he ſpeaks) but eſpecially to all the miniſtry, (whom he calls* Wolves *and* Theeves) *and*

and mainely to the Bishops what they are to expect; for loading them outragiously with all sorts of reproaches, which his wicked heart could prompt him to utter, he directly endeavours to stir up the people to embrew their hands in their blood, and to destroy them in their innocency, with tragical oh^s! *awakening the rage of the rudest multitude (which he calls zeal of God) to execute judgement on them, that the fierce anger of God may be turned away; and tells them if they do not so,* they are plagued with stupidity and blindness. *All sorts of rulers in the Land, may see their* dittay *and their* doom *drawn in this Libell; and the man should have thanks for discovering the malitious bloody and cruel designs of his party, that these who are concerned, being fore-warned, may be fore-armed,* professa perdunt odia vendictæ locum; *when the snare is sett in a mans sight, he deserves to fall into it, that will fall into it. When a mans deadly enemies proclaim their intentions, if he take not warning and be not upon his guard, who will not think, that in his lifetime he were worthy of a fair hood and bells, and because he perishes in the snare that was set in his sight, he will be thought worthy of* Abners *Epitaph,* Dyed *Abner* as a fool dyeth? *This man will make us wise, whither we will or not, and force us to keep our eyes in our head.*

But as to this infamous Libeller, how irksome a thing were it to follow him closely in all his foolish reasonings that are continually interlaced and larded with foul revilings? How unsuitable were it for one, who desires to keep the constant composure of a Christian spirit, to indulge a humour in retaliating, according as the indignity of his abuses requires: verily, in dealing with men of this stamp (outragious in their opprobrious speeches) defenders of the truth are at a great disadvantage, in regard of these who have sober and grave adversaries to deal with. But it almost transcends humane patience, to treat myldly with such an insolent one as this, who transgresseth so far the bounds of all humane modesty in dealing with all sorts of persons in Authority, as will be seen anone.

Although then, a more then ordinary vehemency of a keen ſtile ſhould be uſed, in beating down the fierceneſs of one ſo exceſſively inſolent (whoſe intemperate pride deſpiſeth moderate remedies) good and wiſe men will not judge it very criminal, but at leaſt, ſomewhat excuſable. Shall Maſters of confuſion, indulging themſelves in their proud moroſity, unworthily demean themſelves toward the ſober defenders of the truth? and will not this be ſufficient Apology for them, to put forth ſome ſting, and uſe ſome meaſure of vehemency in this caſe? Should ſuch a perſon as this, who (as the Poets feign of Hecuba, *metamorphoſed into a mad barking bitch, after the deſtruction of* Troy) *barks and bawles, and dares with his furious petulant and peſtilent pen overrun and beſpatter King, Parliament, Council, Nobles, Judges, Biſhops, Miniſters and all ranks of people in the Land: ſhould he be ſmoothed and ſtroaked with ſoft words? might not poſſibly a too faint-like and toothleſs defenſe of the truth tend to harden him and his complices, and breed ſuſpition of ſome ſigns of diffidence, diſtruſt and timorouſneſs in owning the truth and righteouſneſſe of the cauſe that is owned againſt him?*

Sed motos præſtat componere fluctus.

It ſhall be fitter to conſider what becomes us to utter, then what becomes him to hear; or what he is worthy of. There lyes indeed a tentation in theſe nameleſs writings (which therefore, it is to be wiſhed were not in uſe) to exceed in paſſions and to utter words (incognito) *that will not be ſtood to; but remembring*, that we have not ſo learn'd Chriſt, as to render revilling for reviling, and that mans wrath works not the righteouſneſs of God; *(though ſometimes it is for peoples edification to ſee the due characters of ſuch as lead them out of the way) ſo far as humane infirmity permitts, the truth ſhall be ſearched after, and ſpoken in love; all bitterneſs, wrath, anger and clamour with all malice being put away: but if any thing aculeat and pungent do eſcape, it not being uſed in any private cauſe or quarrel, but in the publick concerns of truth, of the Church of God and of the State of the Common-wealth, nor proceeding from any private*

private revenge (there being room enough in our fraternal affection for any, who will leave their unchristian, sanguinary and inhumane wayes) it will at least be excused by the judicious and wise. And if any such thing be, it is heartily wished, it may prick the Libeller to repentance for these things, wherein he hath already put himself to shame.

But to prepare for consideration of the matter of this infamous Libel, it shall be fit, to advert how palpably and closely this man treads in the foot-steps of the old Masters of confusion the Anabaptists: It shall not be said, that his complices or he, are arrived to the owning of the highest mysteries of that Sect, in the points of Enthusiasme and Libertinisme, nor that they are so cruel, as to exclude Christian infants from their Birth-right priviledge of Baptisme; howbeit, it is worthy to be considered, how far the common demand of expresse command or example in Scripture, for Episcopacy may reach the Anabaptists conclusion concerning infants. And this man, doth let fall such tenets, as smell too rankly of the foul scum of the high flown Anabaptistical and Enthusiastical way; while he tells us, (pag. 21. *&c.*) That meer private men may now a dayes, take their impulses of Zeal, as a sufficient call, to pull down all Magistrates from their seats which they abuse, to execute judgement on them, and to place themselves in their rooms; *thinking, that* Phineas *act may justifie them, and while he tells us*, pag. 105. that a Ministers external call, is not in ordination by them, who have power upon trial of gifts; but in having such a visible evidence of the call of Jesus Christ, as in reason and charity doth obliege all men, to receive the person so called, as truly sent: *These with several other points, tending to Libertinisme; yea, and to the aboolishing of the sense of grossest sins in people, are vented here, as may be seen in the progress. But our maine work shall be, to shew the face of this mans way, and how Anabaptistical-like it looks, in some particular practices, wherein the similitude will hold without much halting, that if he will not be he healed, others may be warned.* 1. The

1. *The Sect of Anabaptists laboured much, (as the learned men that knew them and dealt with them declare) to overthrow Magistracy in the places where they lived; they represented the secular powers unto the people, as the ungodly of the world, instigating and stirring them up, to pull them all down, as the oppressors of their liberty in spirituals and civils: They denied all authority to Magistrates in Church matters, averring, they ought not to medle in matters of Religion or Faith, nor use any compulsion on men, so much as to urge them to the use of the external meanes of Gods worship. And upon the ground,* (Luke, 22. The Kings of the Nations, *&c.* it shall not be so amongst you, *which is pressed against Superiorities amongst Churchmen*) *They pleaded with no less plausibleness against superiority of Magistrates, amongst and over Christians, although when they came to some strength at* Munster, *they would have their own King,* John *of* Leyden *the Taylor.*

2. *As they studied to overthrow the ordinance of Magistracy, so also the other divine ordinance of Ministery; these being, as it were, the two great lights, the Sun and the Moon, which God hath appointed to guid the world: These masters of confusion, would extinguish them both, that they might vent their wares in the world, for destroying not only humane Societies, but the Souls of men. In order to the ruine of the Ministery, they declaimed most bitterly against all of that function, (that were not of their way) as* Hirelings, Thieves *and* Wolves, Ignorant-beasts, Priests of Baal, cursed Creatures, Servants of Sathan, *and what ever else their invenomd hearts could prompt them to utter against Christs Ministers to work their disgrace amongst the people, and so to defame them, that they might be useless in the service of God: Their great work was, to exclude faithful Ministers from the esteem of Gods people, that they might affect them only, and that they might have ready accesse to poyson them with their perverse Doctrines and Dictates of sublime, unconceivable nonsense, set forth under the garb of a glancing novelty of words.*

3. *They bent themselves to work division in the Church of*

God,

God, and to move people to forſake the aſſembling of themſelves together in Church-meetings, and to follow them to ſeek Chriſt in private Conventicles, where they might with freedom enough open their hearts, and debauch them into their way. The Church meetings they reckoned no better of, then as of droves and herds of hoggs, confuſed mixtures, unworthy the name of Churches and wherein no bleſſing was to be expected to the Ordinances.

4. *They were above all men arrogant and proud deſpiſers of ſuch as were not of their way, as being men without God in the world, reprobate and wicked, denying to them even common civilities.*

5. *When any of theirs were puniſhed, either for their errors, or for fellony, murther or rebellion, they heavily lamented the removeal of the dear ſervants of God, crying them up for Martyrs, and complaining tragically, that truth and godlineſs was oppreſſed; and that men, who would have all things done according to Gods word, were not ſuffered to live in a perſecuting world.*

How neer this man (with his complices) doth approach to the manners of that odious Sect in theſe particulars, may ſome way appear from this Libell, *and the* Apology. *When the ſpirit, that ſtirreth in theſe furious writings (eſpecially in* Naphthali, *wherein the evil man waxeth worſe and worſe) is conſidered; how much confuſion may be ſeen to be portended to Church and State, if hearts be infected with the Doctrines therein held forth. It is greatly to be wiſhed and prayed for, that the Lord may give his people ſuch underſtanding, that they be not ignorant of the wiles of Sathan, who drives a deeper deſign againſt this poor Church and Land, then the ſubverſion of this or that exterior form of Church-Government. The controverſie reſts not in matters touching a Biſhop, or a Preſbytery, which (if mens paſſions or prejudices might permit) may be for the advantage of the Goſpel well conſolidated by their mutual paying of due reſpects one to another, the epiſcopal inſpection not abrogating, but ſtrengthening the due right of*

Presbyters, and Presbyters not despising that lawful inspection, but all concurring together in a kindly mutual assistance, and amicable conjunction, for carrying on the real interests of Christs Kingdom without imperiousness on the one side, and without froward disorderlines on the other. But this polemical Presbyterian (as he would seem to be, though he and his brethren in evil have ruined that way of Presbytery long ago) accounts such matters too low to stand upon. The design his Libel runs upon, is to open a gap to endlesse rebellions, under whatsoever constitution of Church-Government. And not only to bring all our Magistrates from the highest to the lowest under disgrace (which is the next step to destruction, and to make them a sacrifice to the fury of the wicked people) but to ruine Kingly Authority and Magistracy, the Ordinance of God, and to dissolve humane Societies and Kingdoms (as shall be seen) and especially to ruine this Kingdom. There is a great noise made, (it may be, it is not causles, and it were to be wished, Rulers looked to it) of the increase of Popery: but truly, when the spirit of such writings as this, is considered, it will be found, there is cause to fear, (unless the wisdom and goodness of God, and the prudence of the King and Governors under him prevent) That as one way, the Roman Antichrist may come in; So, some furious successor of John *of* Leyden, *under pretence of a* Phineas-*like spirit, come in another way, upon our Church and Land, to lay it waste, and to make it a field of confusion and blood; the seeds of future miseries, being too visibly sowen by this man and his complices; whose mouths, are full of Blasphemies, as their hearts and hands are full of blood. That this Libell and the like, are not more quickly followed, with meet animadversions, is not to be marvelled at by any, who knowes they are like the Pestilence that walks in darkness; and that hardly do they come to the hands of any, but such as are willing to be deceived by them, being intended for the blinding of these, not for the opening the eyes of others; Yet now, (that this piece*

is

is in our hand) it (with its fellowes) deserves some consideration, and what shall be said, shall be reduced to these heads, viz. *The Libellers endeavour to confound humane Societies and to overthrow Magistracy; His injurious revilings of the Kings Majesty, Parliament, Council, Commission, Judges, Town of* Edinburgh, *&c. His reproaches against the Ministery of the Church and all ranks thereof, with his unsound Doctrines anent their Callings and Stations; His endeavours to dissipate the Church of Christ in this Land, and therein to state a perpetual schisme; His Damnable pride and contempt of all others; His tragical complaints of persecution, and vainglorying in the Martyrs of his way. In touching upon these, the most material things of his book shall be spoken to, in the following part of this treatise; withall, for the Reader's edification, we shall now and then turn aside to usefull digressions. As,* 1. *Concerning his Majesties Supremacy in Church affairs, which this Libeller calls falsly an usurpation of the Crown of Christ.* 2. *Concerning the Covenants and obligation thereof, and the falsly alledged perjury in owning Episcopacy.* 3. *Concerning the warrantableness of the Episcopal office, falsely called by the Libeller Antichristian usurpation.* 4. *Concerning the lawfulness of the calling of the present Ministery of* Scotland, *whom he calls* Thieves, Wolves, *&c.* 5. *The sinfulness of stating a separation from our Church-assemblies, which he calls* Curats Conventicles. *Those things being with any satisfaction spoken to, once for all, (for, Who can endure that profusion of pretious time, as to be alwayes drawing the rug-saw of contention about such matters?) will contribute to clear our judgements and allay our animosities. The Lord give us understanding in all things, and blesse us with truth and peace.*

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THe Libeller his endeavours to confound and diſſolve humane Societies, and to overthrow Magiſtracy in this Land. Page. 1.

CHAP. II.

Of violent reſiſtance to the Powers ordain'd of God, by meer private perſons their Subjects Page 12.

CHAP. III.

That ſuch as are inveſted with ſacred and inviolable Soveraignty, have divine exemption and priviledge of impunity from their own Subjects. Page 71.

CHAP. IV.

Anent the following of Phineas *fact; of heroick or extraordinary impulſions, and concerning ſome courſes taken at our firſt Reformation, and their exemplarineſs.* Page 104.

PART

PART I.

CHAP. I.

The Libeller his endeavours to confound and dissolve humane Societies, and to overthrow Magistracy in this Land.

GOD Almighty, having made Man a rational Creature and fit for society, (ζωον τη φυσει πολιτικον, as the Philosopher speaketh) hath appointed (besides œconomical Societies) the coalition of people into greater Bodies, consisting of many Families under one Political Government, for mutual help to be given by men (one to another) in their necessities; for protection both of the whole Body, and of every Member interessed in the Society, and for the procuring of the good and happiness of all in this life, and in a better. That these Societies might be orderly regulated in their acts, the God of order hath appointed superiour Powers and Heads over the multitudes of men, in several bounds of the world where he hath disposed their habitations. Magistracy, God's Ordinance, is that golden clasp and band, that holds together humane Societies in a consistent unity, that mens corruptions may not dash them one upon another, as pot-sheards, to their mutual ruine and general confusion. Magistracy is as the vital Spirits of humane Societies, without which they were but as dead carcasses; it is as the Nerves and Sinews in the Body, without which there could be no right motion. Hence there are no Nations so barbarous, but by natural instinct and the dictates of reason, are led together into politick associations for their subsistance in general, for the mutual help one of another, and for the protection of the weaker against the violence and wrongs of the stronger. And by a divine instinct, great multitudes of men embodyed together, are brought to humble themselves and submit to Magistracy of one sort or another; which is not a meer device of wise men, but an holy Ordinance of the only wise God. *Vocatio est* (saith *Calv. lib. 4. inst. cap. 20. S. 4.*) *non modo sancta & legitima coram*

coram Deo, sed sacerrima & in totâ mortalium vitâ longè honestissima. Now, albeit the Lord hath not, by any precept, particularly determined the bounds of every embodyed political Society (there being some greater, some lesser, acting under their several Heads and Soveraign Magistrates) Yet when politick Bodies are setled in voluntary associations, or what ever way in the course of Divine Providence they have been reduced to live under the same Laws and Authorities, and have continued long in the union of a common interest, under the protection of Magistracy, to break off from the body in seditious secessions, cannot but be displeasing to God. And they are no other then Firebrands, confounders of humane Society, fighters against God and his Ordinance, who (working upon the advantages they have from peoples discontentments upon whatever pretence) do instigate them either to cut off themselves from the body of the Common-wealth, whereof they are Members, or to fall with violence upon the whole body, (though they be the far lesser part thereof) or to invade the inviolable (by Subjects) Majesty of the supreme Authority, which bears the sacred impress of God. How far this Libeller goeth this way, shall appear by his Tenets.

This Libeller's mind is plainly this, "That when the ends of Govern-"ment are manifestly perverted, the injured persons (one or moe) obli-"gation thereunto ceaseth, the band thereof is dissolved, they are liberate "from it, and do relapse into their primæve liberty and priviledge; and "as the similitude of their case and exigence of cause doth require, may "upon the very same principles again associate and joyn for their better "defence and preservation, as they did at first enter into Societies. Thus he, Pag. 16. Pag. 150. And further he avows, "That not only "no obedience, but no allegiance (*n. b.*) is to be given to any created "Power on earth, but with this restriction, *in defence of Religion and* "*Liberty, according to the Covenants*, Pag. 177. And what Religion he means, in application to the hypothesis of the Times, he explains plainly, Pag. 54. where he sayes, "The extirpation of Prelacy is the "main covenanted Religious Duty, in the endeavour whereof, all the "zeal of the faithful should be concentred. And as to the liberty of the Subjects, the determining of what it is, must not be referred to the Subjects Representatives in Parliament: For, saith he, Pag. 102. "The "Parliament, under pretence of vindicating and declaring the Kings just "Right and Prerogative, have wholly corrupted and innovated the "well-tempered and firm constitution of our ancient Government, and "utterly subverted the liberty of the Subject, Pag. 95. So that what this

this liberty is, muſt be referred to the private diſcretive judgement of every man, and this muſt determine him to his Acts of violent reſiſtance, and vindication of liberty according to the Covenant. And in reference to the caſe of the Nation in theſe Times, the man is ſo far tranſported as to teach the people, "That their liberty is ſo far loſt, that they "are reduced to the condition of a moſt inſupportable and unnatural "conqueſt, which ſhould be a moſt juſt cauſe and provocation to all "ingenuous Spirits and good Patriots, to undertake the aſſerting of "their own liberty upon the greateſt peril, Page 116. And that the "preſſures and grievances of the Nation, by reaſon only of that Court "of Commiſſion for executing the Laws anent Church matters, do far "exceed all the preſſures and injuries of that Spaniſh inquiſition, where-"upon the United Provinces have juſtified and approved their revolt "from the King of *Spain*, Page 126. So that this mans deſign is clear from his words, to diſſolve and confound this Kingdom, to move them who will be taken in his ſnare, to renounce Allegiance to the King; to revolt from him, as having better cauſe then the United Provinces had to revolt from the King of *Spain*; to combine themſelves in new Societies to their own mind (they being now relapſed into their primæve liberty, and the obligation to the Government being looſed) and that every man and every Party, as they find themſelves ſtrong enough, ſhould upon their own diſcretive judgement of what is their due civil Liberty, as well as what is right Religion; and upon their greateſt peril undertake not only violent reſiſtance of all powers above them, but valiant vindication of Religion and Liberties, and reforming what they think amiſſe *vi & armis*, even to the puniſhing all and whatſoever perſon that will oppoſe them in their way.

The particulars ſhall be after ſpoken to, but now more generally we conſider his fundamental Doctrines of confuſion. That the true ends of inſtituting civil Government, are the true happineſs of People here and hereafter, and the glory of God: and that Magiſtrates and Governours are oblieged to proſecute theſe ends, no Judicious Chriſtian will queſtion. All the queſtion is, anent the Duty of the fearers of God, in the caſe of the perverſion of the ends of Government by thoſe in whoſe hand it is, whether, when this perverſion is manifeſt, the band and tye to the Government ceaſeth, as to the perſons injur'd thereby; and whither this be the caſe, as matters are now ſtated, that private perſons, or any number of them, are for the preſent (ſuppos'd) perverſions of the ends of Government, diſoblieged from all tyes to the ſame, and relaps'd into their primæve liberty and priviledge, to combine

in Societies which are to their mind (as at first they did associate themselves in the political bodies whereof now they are members) for their own good and preservatjon.

As for the general position, or affirmative resolution to the former question, it is undoubtedly both unchristian and unreasonable. When was there at any time greater perversion and straying from the ends of Government, then was in the times of many of the holy Prophets of God, and in the times of Christ, his holy Apostles and the primitive Christians, who were both repleniſh'd with much light to know their duties, and much zeal to act for the honour of God against all perils and dangers whatsoever lying in their way? Government was perverted by manifest Idolatry and horrid Tyranny, many monsters of men possessing the thrones of Soveraignty: yet, look over all the sacred Writings of the holy Prophets, look to the history of the life and actions of Christ and his Apostles, or to the history of the great Lights of the primitive Church for many hundreds of years, and see if any of the teachers taught such doctrine, that in case of the manifest perversion of the ends of Government, people did relapse into their primæve liberty and priviledge, to combine with whom they pleased, to forsake the union with these political bodies with which they were conjoyn'd, or that they were liberated from the obligation and band to the civil order and Government under which they were; or if that was the sense of any of the godly, zealous Christians, and fearers of God in these times, who alwayes keeped themselves pure from sinning against God, refusing obedience unto mens unlawful Commandments, but the Doctrine of these new Christians never came in their hearts, that they should make secessions from the civil Societies wherein they lived, so long as they keep'd within the bounds over which such or such Government was, and account all their obligation to abused Government dissolved: Yea upon the contrary, as there are never to be found amongst the people fearing God, any such rentings of the States and Common-wealths they lived in, approven of God, or injoyn'd by his Prophets in his name; So, in reproving sins and menacing judgements against these in Authority, (albeit they grievously abused their places) yet the Prophets, Apostles, and Christ also, studied to preserve respects to the Soveraignty and Powers set over People; and while they warn'd all from the highest to the lowest to amend their wayes, they guarded against seditious dissolutions of the Common-wealth on any pretext, never prescribing rebellion and revolting (the greater sin) as the cure of Tyranny or irreligiousness in the Actings of Powers. What abusers of Government,

and

and perverters of the ends thereof, were *Tiberius Claudius, Nero, Domitian?* &c. yet Christ will have *Cæsars* due given him; and his Apostles presse subjection to them, Honor to be given them, Tribute to be paid to them, Prayers to be made for them; not for destroying them and their Government, but for preserving their Persons and sanctifying their hearts, that they might govern rightly and peaceably, (a Prayer Point-blank contrary to endeavours to disturbe their Kingdoms by seditious courses, to dissolve and dissipate them, and to take vengeance on their persons.) So that they must needs be the disciples (not of *Christ*, or *Paul*, or *Peter*) but of *Judas* of *Galilee*, and of *Theudas*, *Acts* 5. 36, 37. who upon account of perversion of Government, teach any part of the people to dissolve and confound the Societies whereof they are members, and that the obligation being loosed from the Government, they may break off from it, and erect themselves in new Combinations and Societies with whom they think best. If this may passe for good divinity, the grand enemy shall never want opportunity of casting Fire-balls in humane Societies, and working confusion and every evil work.

But as this position is very dissonant from Religion, so it is no less to sound reason, for it hath a clear tendency, to the breaking and crumbling in pieces of all humane political Societies, all Commonwealths and Kingdoms of the World, which no wit of Man can preserve from dissolution, if once this Principle be drunk into the hearts of People and sink there: For by this mans opinion, the judgement of the perversion of the ends of Government in tyranny, oppression, &c. is alwayes put over to the discretion of the sufferers of prejudice by it, (were they never so few, in comparison of the whole body of the people) they may pronounce upon the same, and according to their discretive judgement, of the injurious perverting of Government, determine their actions, for renouncing or revolting from the society in which, and Government under which, they are, and nothing should hinder them from this, but want of probable capacity to through their work, (as he often speaks) So wise and cautious must his followers be, (though not conscientious) that in working a mischief, they light not upon a mischief.

Good God! to what times are we reserved, wherein the unmeasurable audaciousness of men, dare present such poyson to a Christian People; and to attempt the breaking them in pieces by such Doctrines, which both Religion and sound Reason abhorres? Dare this Libeller say, that this is a fundamental constitution of political Societies,

that

that at the arbitrement and luſt of any minor part of private perſons, pretending a perverſion of the ends of Government, (a pretence that will never be wanting, to malecontents and malapert wicked ones even katherines and highlandiſh theeves, and it is real to them, if they themſelves be admitted Judges) they may make ſeceſſion from the Society in which they are embodied, and renounce their obligation to the Government thereof? Is not ſuch a principle, rather contra-fundamental to all humane combined Societies? and were it at firſt entring of the Society, expreſly propoſed, that when ever any minor party ſhould account the ends of Government perverted, they ſhould be at their primæve liberty again, to break off from all the magiſtratical Order, and from ſociety with the major party of theſe, with whom they are combined: Would not the overture of ſuch a condition be rejected with indignation and upon juſt reaſon? for that were to open a gap to continual ſeditions, diviſions and fractions. And all rational men would judge it were better not to joyn in ſociety with ſuch men, then to joyn in ſuch termes.

Again, ſuppoſe there be a breaking off from a magiſtratical Power, and major part of a ſociety, upon pretenſion (which will never be wanting to cover ſedition and confuſion, ſuch is the corruption of men) of a perverſion of the ends of Government; the party making ſeceſſion, may haply meet with that ſame meaſure they gave to the Community, wherewith they were formerly joyned. For, when they have combined and embodied themſelves in a Society, if a minor party ariſe amongſt themſelves, with the ſame accuſations againſt them, which they had againſt the body they did ſeparate from; Muſt not that ſame party, have the ſame priviledge of Primæve liberty, to combine and erect a corporation by themſelves, which they claimed before? will not they plead, that the obligation to the Government and Society ceaſeth, and they are free to erect a new one? And where ſhall there be a ſtand, till humane Societies be miſerably broken in pieces, which ſeems to be Satans deſign, by this Mans Doctrine?

Further, can this aſſertion ſubſiſt, that neither alledgiance or fidelity, nor obedience, is to be given unto any created power, but in defence of Religion and Liberty? That obedience is not to be given unto any Creature on earth, againſt Religion, or the Revealed Will of God, ſhall be eaſily granted; we abhorre the very thought of ſo doing. Again, it ſhall not be ſaid, that obedience is to be given to Powers, againſt the Liberty competent to us, as Subjects, and conſiſtent with Soveraignty; yet ſo, that the meaſure of that Liberty, muſt not be made by every private

vate mans will; but by the Declarature of the Parliament, representative of the Subjects, which best knows what thereunto belongs: But to say, that all (not only obedience, but) alledgiance and fidelity, due to any created power, is indispensibly restricted to this qualification, *in Defence of Religion and Liberty*, *viz.* of the Subject, is a most false assertion. It is known, that a restriction excludes all other cases, which are not in the restrictive proposition included; now it is certain, there may be cases, wherein we ought to obey the Magistrate, and yet the act of obedience cannot be properly and directly said, to be either in defence of Religion, or the Liberty of the Subject; there may be some causes that properly concern his own honour; wherein defence of Religion is not concerned, (the Magistrate perhaps not being of our Religion) and far less defence of the Liberty of the Subject, (unless by a very remote and unnecessary consequence) yet am I bound to him in causes concerning his honour; this made the Ministers that disputed with the Doctors of *Aberdeen*, decline to acknowledge that clause of the first Covenant, *in defence of Religion &c.* to be limitative or restrictive of duty to the King, affirming it onely to be specificative, aming duties to him in some respects, or in respect to some things, not excluding others: Yea, the General Assembly, 1639. will not have that clause in the Covenant restrictive; for in their supplication to the Commissioner and Council, they speak thus: "We have solemly sworn and do swear, not only our mutual concurrence and "assistance, for the cause of Religion, and to the utmost of our power, "with our Means and Lives, to stand to the defence of our Dread Sovereign, His Person and Authority, in the preservation of true Religion, Liberties and Laws of this Kirk and Kingdom; but also (*n. b.*) "in every cause that may concern His Majesties Honour, shall concur "with our friends and followers, as we shall be required, *&c.* So Duty and Obedience to the King is there extended, beyond what is expresly mentioned in the Covenant, (In defence of Religion and Liberties.) But further, as to the point of Alledgiance or Fidelity, that is another matter then Obedience: Alledgiance to a King imports, owning him as Lawful and Rightful King, and that none others have power over him; together with fidelity to his Person, Crown and Dignity, against all conspiracies and treason. Obedience is the result of this acknowledged Soveraignty, (where commands appear lawful.) A man may keep Alledgiance and Fidelity to the King, albeit sometimes there may be commands given, which cannot be obeyed, because of Gods countermand; many learned Priests and Papists in *England*,

took

took the Oath of Alledgiance, when first it was emitted and injoyn'd, albeit they thought they could not give obedience to the King, as to matters of Religion. But this man is plain in his assertion, that no Alledgiance is due to the King, except with this restriction, *in defence of Religion*: And (as he said) a main part of his Religion is to erect Presbytery, and root out Prelacy; So that if Presbytery be not defended, people are taught to renounce Alledgiance to the King. How contrary is this to the *Confession of Faith*, cap. 23. S. 4. Difference in Religion doth not (saith the *Confession*) make void the Magistrates just and legal Authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him: But this man will have no Alledgiance due to him, nor Obedience, but in defence of Religion; which it is like he will not defend, if he be of a different perswasion in matters of Religion, and so must his Authority be made void.

The contrary Thesis we must rest upon, that although a supreme Magistrate defend not Religion, yet Alledgiance and Fidelity is alwayes due to him, and Obedience also in all things lawful. It is the Lords way for keeping humane Societies from grosse disorders, to allow to such as are in supreme Power by lawful calling, the honour due unto their place, even although in the main things they pervert the ends of Government; not glorifying God by advancing true Religion, but dishonouring him by false Religion, or seducing others to their evil way, and persecuting them who follow not their unlawful commandments. Yet, where administrations of Justice in civil things are tolerably managed, and civil Societies by Magistratical Authority kept in tolerable order, (that there be no general out-breakings in outragious oppressions) God will have due respects payed to the places of Authority and persons therein installed, and will reckon dreadfully with them for any perversions of the ends of Government, in his own time. Though *Cæsar* give not God his due, yet it is Christs mind that we give *Cæsar* his due, and his Apostles mind that he should be honoured; not for his personal faults or abuse of his power, but because he is invested with power from God; which though he abuseth, yet it remains the Ordinance of God. And hereunto Mr. *Calvin* fully agrees, *lib. 4. instit. cap. 20. S. 24, 25. &c.* where at length he asserts, "That Alledgiance "and Obedience (in things lawful) is due even to the worst of Princes, "and who do most manifestly pervert the ends of Government, by pri- "vate Subjects, (of which our question is now) S. 25. *Si Dei ver-* "*bum respicimus longius nos deducet* (*viz.* then to give alledgiance to "good Princes) *ut non eorum modo principum imperio subditi simus*

"*qui*

" *qui probe & qua debent fide, munere suo erga nos defunguntur sed* " *omnium qui quoquo modo rerum potiuntur, etiamsi nihil minus* " *præstent quam quod ex officio erat principum.* Again, *Omnes* (saith " he, speaking of evil Princes) *illa sancta Majestate sunt præditi, qua* " *legitimam potestatem instruxit Deus.* Again, *In homine deter-* " *rimo, honoreque omni indignissimo, penes quem modo sit publica po-* " *testas, præclara illa & divina potestas residet, quam Dominus justitiæ* " *& judicii sui ministris verbo suo detulit, proinde à subditis eadem* " *reverentia & dignatione habendus est, quantum ad publicam obedi-* " *entiam attinet qua optimum Regem, si daretur, habituri essent.* Again, S. 27. he sayes of an evil King, " *Assumptus est in Regiam* " *Majestatem, quam violare, nefas est.* Again, *Nunquam in animum* " *nobis seditiosæ illæ cogitationes veniant tractandum esse pro meritis* " *Regem, nec æquum esse, ut subditos nos ei præstemus, qui vicissim* " *Regem nobis se non præstet.*

Any may see, that in the matter of Civil Government, Mr. *Calvin* was of another and a better spirit than these men, who inflame the people with their seditious Doctrine; and tells them, if the King do not his duty, their alledgiance to him and obligation to his Government ceaseth; and no alledgiance nor obedience due to him, when he does not (or does contrary to) his duty.

But, 2. As the Position in it self is most unchristian and irrational, so the application of it to the case in these Times, made by this Master of confusion, is most unjust; for (not to speak of the first times of Reformation, wherein he sayes, that there was such perversion of the ends of Government, as made the obligation of the injured Subjects thereto to cease, Pag. 16.) he repeats the same more fully, Pag. 150. to justifie the late Insurrection against the King; as if now there were such manifest and notorious perversion of the ends of Government, that the band thereof is loosed, and people are relapsed into their primæve liberty, to joyn in new Societies and Combinations as they see fit, rejecting the old. Now, may not any see the desperate design of this Libeller and his like, to dissipate and dissolve the immemorially settled frame of this Nation and Kingdom, which through divine Providence, hath in many generations subsisted under our lawful Soveraigns, for the common benefit of the Subjects at home, and to the honour and renown of the Nation abroad; yea, and to the glory of divine Providence, which hath through many storms, in several ages, preserved us in this comfortable constitution. But behold, a foul gap is now opened to let in all confusion upon us, and to dissipate and

break us in pieces miserably, (if such wicked Doctrine take upon people, God guard their hearts, we hope *sanctiores sunt aures & corda auditorum quam linguæ Doctorum*, as to this) Now it is left to the arbitrement and lust of every party, even lesser party of the people, to break off the old union with the Nation, to erect themselves into new Societies and Combinations, as being now as free as if they had not been members of this Nation; they are relapsed into their primæve liberty, and now every Paroch in *Galloway* is allowed to cantonize themselves into a free Re-publick, or to become a little Kingdom of *Ivetot*, or make Combinations, and Heads of these Combinations, as they see fit; for they are liberate and loosed from the old Society and Government, because the ends thereof are so manifestly perverted: Andwherein, forsooth? Doth not the true Protestant Religion, as it is held forth in Scripture, and was publickly confessed by our first Reformers, (which Confession is registred, *Parl.* 1. K. *James* 6.) through Gods mercy, continue with us, without variation from it in the least? Doth not the Kings Majesty protect and advance this blessed Truth of the Saving Gospel, and incourage and invite all according to his power to embrace it? Is he not willing and desirous that the Laws be vigorously executed against Papists, and all perverters of this sound Doctrine? If there be deficiency in execution, the blame lyes elsewhere then upon him. Are Gods people, or any people in the Land, spoiled of their lawful civil Liberties? What one thing hath he done without consent of the peoples Representatives in Parliament, at which any may except as a grievance? What burthen hath he laid upon their Estates, but by Law, or by their own consent in a necessary exigence? What should be the great ground then of so horrid a dismembring of the body of this Common-wealth and secession from the civil Society, and from subjection to the lawful Government thereof, as this man teaches and would perswade? What is that so fundamental perversion of the ends of Government, that may, to any minor party that pleases, bear the weight of a rational licence to reject the Government and the Society of the Common-wealth, to erect themselves into new separate and politick Bodies? Or, that may perswade them, as the case stands, they are relapsed into their primæve liberty, like the Fishes of the Sea that have no Ruler? Or that now being liberate, they are free (as they were at first) to combine themselves in new Societies as they see fit? It must surely be some great thing that should warrand such great actions. It were too much to question their judgement, to assert, that they indeed think, that because the

moderate

moderate Episcopacy, and inspection of some Ministers over others in several parts of the Land to hold them to their duties, (established by former Laws) is now re-established by the King, with consent of his people in Parliament, (the lawfulness of which shall be afterwards spoken to) That therefore this, and legal courses for carrying on of this, is sufficient ground for so unnatural a rupture, although the King should not, for the pleasure of an inconsiderable party, recede from owning and prosecuting his just Laws concerning this; experience having abundantly taught, that giving way to evil humours and unreasonable demands, is but a mean to provoke to greater insolencies. But under such pretensions against a lawful way, surely something lurketh that doth not yet appear: For, supposing a change of the established way, it is folly to think the matter should there rest; this man and his party are of another spirit then to be satisfied with such low matters, (were they according to his mind) for all, alongs in his *Naphtali* and *Apology* Prerogative is the mark that is shot at as well as Prelacy, (as we shall see) the one is as great an eye-sore as the other. And were all other quarrels that seemed to touch upon Religion laid aside, yet is not the battel done without retrenchment of Royal Prerogative (even in civil things) which as well as in Ecclesiastical, is disputed down in the *Apology*, but most weakly and foolishly. And still also, the liberty of the Subject should be a subject of controversie; wherein this high-flown man, his Party and complices, will not have the Parliament to be Judge, what is the true Liberty of the People (consistent with Soveraignty) or what not, (for this man sets forth the late Parliament, as the great betrayers of the Liberty of the People) but every Covenanter must make his discretive judgement his rule, to determine his actings for the Liberty of the People. And if there be any Party in sufficient capacity to take the fields, they will, and must, according to their discretion, carve out the measure of the Subjects Liberties, (which it is like will be large enough, at least, toward themselves, if not toward others) and will account themselves bound by Covenant, (according to their own interpretation) to fight to death for what they count Liberty; and to forsake the Government and Society of others in the Land, (though they be the far lesse part) and erect new Combinations of their own under new Heads, that they may injoy their Covenanted Liberty, which the perverted Government deprives them of, and from which therefore they are loosed and liberated for ever, and reduced to their primæve liberty to choose Government and Societies as best liketh them. Oh miserable confusion! that men of perverse

pirits ſtrive to drive this poor Nation into! Were Epiſcopacy out of the Nation and out of the World, there have been and are in this Time, ſuch peſtilent Principles, vented by perverſe Teachers, tending to the perpetual diſquietneſs of the State of the Kingdom; that if People be poſſeſſed with the ſame, there is no ſecurity for the moſt juſt and juſtly acting Authority, nor any reſt nor peace amongſt people, but continual ſtirrings are to be looked for, as there are occaſions of Firebrands to inflame them. But it is to be hoped, that the wiſe and godly management of the preſent Government continued, will in time wear out that irreverence to Soveraign Authority, and unquietneſs of a ſeditious humor, that hath too much prevailed by the principles and practices of many in theſe Times.

CHAP. II.

Of violent reſiſtance to the Powers ordain'd of God, by meer private perſons their Subjects.

THe point of violent reſiſtance to the Supreme Magiſtrate by Subjects, hath been hotly and violently debated both elſewhere and in thoſe Lands upon ſad occaſions. The more moderate Aſſerters of it, do not give the liberty of ſo doing unto meer private perſons, nor againſt Princes *integræ Majeſtatis*, or who have come to their Kingdoms without pactions of reſtraint put on them by the people: nor do they at all grant the liberty of this reſiſtance, but in the caſe of immaneſt Tyranny and extreameſt Cruelty, againſt the Body or moſt conſiderable part of the Body of the Commonwealth or ſuch like, or in caſe of ſudden perſonal extra-judicial, illegal invaſions, importing irreparable loſſe of life, *&c.* (wherein judicious Royaliſts will not much differ from others) nor do they grant a liberty to proceed beyond the bounds of *inculpatæ tutelæ*, innocent and harmleſſe ſelf-defence; for if either there be a preventive invaſion of the Magiſtrat, or a ſucceeding revenge if he be brought under, all agree that this exceeds *moderamen inculpatæ tutelæ*, ſo men are not properly ſelf-defenders, but Magiſtrate-invaders. And whatever power of defence is allowed to inferiour Magiſtrates with the People, yet, that meer Subjects, or private perſons, ſhould take on them power of judging or puniſhing the Supreme Magiſtrate, or puniſhing him, it is abhorrent from the common ſenſe of Chriſtian and Learned men.

But this Libeller goes a great length: for, not only doth he allow the body of the People, with inferiour Magiſtrates, to make violent reſiſtance to the King, whenſoever they think he wrongs them; but allows any

any part of the People (only requiring that they make ſure that they are in probable capacity to carry through their matters) to riſe in Arms and make violent reſiſtance to all the Magiſtrates ſupreme and ſubordinate; yea, and againſt all the major part of the people. And albeit Magiſtrates act according to Laws agreed upon by the repreſentatives of the people; yet this man allows any part of the People (though no Magiſtrate be amongſt them) to take Arms againſt all Magiſtrates, and violently reſiſt them, when they think their Laws either unjuſt, or the puniſhments executed unjuſt; and he maintains, that paſſive ſubjection to unjuſt Laws and Puniſhments, where there is power to make active violent reſiſtance, is a greater ſin then active obedience to unlawful Commands of Magiſtrates. This ſeems ſtrange Doctrine, but more and worſe will be ſeen in the following Chapter But that he may get no wrong, look upon his own words, (referring what he ſpeaks of puniſhing Magiſtrates to the following Chapter.)

There is (ſaith he, Page 8.) *a neceſſity of Convocations and Combinations, not only without, but even againſt Authority; and it is ſufficiently warranded before God and all men for neceſſary and juſt ends. Again, the power of ſelf-defence*, Page 14. (as he calls violent reſiſting the Magiſtrate) *is competent to all men by the inſtinct of pure nature, and is the principal rule of righteouſneſs, and a priviledge competent to all men ſeparately and jointly, not needing any other prerequiſite, but intollerable injury, and is compleated in exerciſe, by a probable capacity to encourage to it. And to ſuffer injury under ptetext of the good of the Common-Wealth, is for the deluſion of an empty name and for the luſts of others, really to deprive a mans ſelf of all ſhare and benefit in it.* Page 15. *propelling by force injuries done in the cauſe of Religion, is the juſteſt quarrel, that men in their primeve liberty could be engaged into.* And, Page 16, 17. *Combinations for aſſiſtance in violent oppoſition of the Magiſtrate, when the ends of Government are perverted (which muſt be referred to the diſcretion of them, who minds inſurrection) are neceſſary by the Law of Nature, of Charity, and in order to Gods glory; and for violation of this duty, of delivering the oppreſſed from Magiſtrates, judgements comes upon people.* And, Page 18, 19. *not only power of ſelf-defence, but vindicative and reforming power is in any part of the people againſt the whole and againſt all Magiſtrates, and if they uſe it not, judgement comes on (ſuppoſing their capacity probable to bear them forth) and they ſhall be puniſh'd for their connivance, and not acting in way of vin-*

vindication of crimes and reforming abuses. And, Page 28. *they are but Flatterers, and Men that have renounced Conscience, who say, that absolute subjection in suffering may be given to Authority abusing their power, and not absolute obedience to their Commands; and whatsoever reason* (saith he) *pleads for absolute subjection in suffering, will far more rationally and plausibly infer unlimited and absolute obedience. Absolute obedience may be more rationally yeelded, then absolute subjection to suffering.* Page 157. *to resist and rise up against persons abusing Authority, is to adhere to God*; and Page 153. *The late rising was altogether lawful, righteous and necessary.* But, what needs insisting on his justifying of any number of private persons, rising up and resisting the whole Magistrates and Body of the People, when ever they think they have cause? seing this is the main scope of his Book, and more too, even to state them in a punitive power of all who are against them, and a power to pull down all Authorities that are in their way, as after shall more clearly appear.

But upon this point of resistance, (which he lispeth out as innocent, harmless self-defence) it is fit we should now (abstracting from the other questions of private persons vindicative and punitive power, till the next Chapter) speak somewhat. It is the subtilty of Sathan and of mans corruption, that most horrid sins and crimes, are covered under very smooth termes, and cloaked with some Vizard of Vertue, or with something so plausible and sweet to self-nature, that few there are who will not own it.

Innocent self-defence and a mans preservation of his own being, is so plausible a Plea, that every one in any vexation that comes upon them, from any (justly or unjustly) are much inclined to take hold of it. It is true, the God of nature, who hath given a being to all creatures, hath also given them inclinations and propensions, to preserve themselves against opposition, destroying nature, the very inanimate creatures have this: Fire preserves and defends it self against water when it is cast upon it; there is a fight between the two contrary qualities of these creatures, the fire with a noise resisting the water, that it be not quenched with the contrary qualities of that creature. So also are the sensitive creatures, the beasts are carried (*impetu naturæ*) to oppose every thing that tends to their destruction, and to preserve their own being, untill they be over-powered: And all this self-defence, is without sin; for they being onely under natures Law, and not under any Legal restraints of the exercise of their self-

defending

defending power, by Gods word, not under any rule of reason in the exercise thereof; do and may to the uttermost (in all cases) endeavour their self-preservation, and nothing can hinder them from it, but *major vis*, and a Physical force greater then theirs is: And this self-defending or preserving power and propension, God hath given also unto Men, yet otherwise then to inanimate creatures, or unto beasts; for these being under no other Law or Order, but that of meer Nature, that onely seeks its own preservation, and labours in self-defence alwayes, against all things afflicting nature *caco impetu*, that self-defence is alwayes sinless. But Mans natural propension to defend himself, is subordinated unto, and limited by, the higher Laws of Reason and Grace, and regulated by respects to the eternal good of the Soul, in following duties to God, (albeit with vexation and trouble upon the outward man) a rational and gracious man, will advert lest in self-preservation, as to his body or outward state, he bring not on self-destruction, as to his Soul: It was wisely said by *Thomas*, 2°. 2ª. *quæst.* 70. *art.* 4. *ad* 2. *Ideo Homini data est Ratio*, (and I may add *Gratia*) *ut eâ ad quæ natura inclinat, non passim, sed secundum rationis, vel grátiæ ordinem exequatur, & ideo non qualibet defensio sui est licita sed quæ fit cum debito moderamine.*

It is too gross Divinity, to bring arguments from Beasts, (who being under no Law of Reason nor Grace, to limite their propensions, may alwayes in all imaginable cases, defend themselves with force) to perswade men that they may do the like, and that their propension for their external preservation, is no more under any restraining rule, to stop the exercise of it, then that of Beasts is. There are many cases of Rational and Gracious restraint, of the exercise of that natural propension for self-preservation, upon Men, which are not upon Beasts. *Lex Rex, p.* 344. *Apol. p.* 162.

For, 1. the Libeller, (it is hoped) will not allow self-defence, (of violent and forcible defence, not of moral, we do here alwayes speak) or violent resistance of the Magistrate, when Men are not in probable Capacity to mend themselves, or when it is seen to be to no purpose; In this case, he will say it is no fault, for a Man not to use violent resistance, because Reason tells him, it is to no purpose; self-defence of a rational creature, should not be meerly natural, but rational; it is natural to a Man to defend himself, as it is to a Beast, but not in the same way, not alwayes when a Beast (upon which, there is no restraint of reason) may do it. It will not be denyed, that the obligation of violent self-preservation ceaseth, when a Man is put out

out (by a Physical force,) of all probable Capacity to help himself.

2. A Man who is justly condemned to death, both according to a just Law, and by a just process according to the Law; though he were in probable capacity to defend himself, with using Force and Violence upon the Magistrate: Yet were it utterly unlawful for him, to use violent self-defence against the Magistrate, with re-offending him; (what ever may be said of Flying, in such a case, when a door is opened, which is no violent resisting) For, as it is a sinful resisting of the Ordinance of God, to refuse Obedience to the Magistrates Lawfull Commands; So it is no lesse sinful resistance of the Ordinance of God, to resist and re-offend the Magistrate lawfuly punishing, or to use force against him for self-preservation, when we are by Providence, brought under the hand of Justice; if the violence used by the Magistrate, on the Person legally sentenced, be just, the violence of the party against the Magistrate, cannot but be unjust and sinful; for, the violence cannot be materially just upon both sides. Here is a clear case, where natures Law of self-preservation, (at least in a way of violence) must cease and be silent, before the Law of Reason and the Will of God, revealed to Men: They are too bold, and come too near to Blaspheme God, (*Lex Rex*) who say, *That it were a mighty defect in Divine Providence, that Men should not have at large a liberty to defend themselves violently, as Beasts have; And that Men were in a worse condition then Beasts, if as Beasts have alwayes power to defend themselves violently, with their Hornes, Heels, Teeth*, &c. *So Men should not have as large a liberty in every case, to use violence upon Magistrates, putting them to vexation, or perhaps troubling them, in life, state*, &c. Men have nobler Prerogatives above Beasts, albeit, they be restrained of that brutish liberty, which Beasts have alwayes and against all.

3. May not the exercise of this priviledge, of self-defence and violent resistance, be restrained by the Grace of God, and the power of His Command for submission, abiding upon a Mans spirit? How easily could *Isaac*, have defended himself, against the violence of his aged Father, in binding him, to be laid on the Altar, to have his throat cut, and his body burnt? Yet, conscience of the pleasure and command of the Soveraign Lord of life and death, makes him, to forbear self-defence, or violent resistance; neither was this forbearance, the sin of self-murther, or against the sixth Command; but a highly Gracious act and eminent Obedience, to the first and greatest Com-

Commandment. Forbearance of ſelf-defence and violent reſiſtance, was there a vertue; an act of obedience and abſolute ſubjection to God, the Lord of his life, not much beneath *Abrahams* obedience, that is ſo highly commended from Heaven.

4. Are there not alſo ſome caſes, not of this extraordinary ſort, wherein ſelf-defence, which this Libeller fooliſhly calls the ſupreme Law of Righteouſneſs, and principal Rule of it, Page 14. (of which we ſhall hear a little anon) muſt ceaſe; As, may not the defence of our temporal life in ſome caſe ceaſe, for the preſervation of the eternal life of our neighbour, when it comes to that, that the defence of the one ſhould be the certain loſs of the other? 1 *John* 3. 16. *Temporalem vitam ſuam pro eterna vita proximi non dubitabit Chriſtianus amittere*, Auguſt. *ad Conſent. lib.* 6. which the School-men have driven ſo far on, that they have thought, that a man in the ſtate of Grace, being invaded by another in the ſtate of ſin, ought rather to be content to be ſlain by the private aggreſſor, then to ſlay him being in ſuch a ſtate of ſin and damnation: to which we ſhall hardly ſubſcribe, leſt it ſhould ſtrike againſt the lawfulneſs of the warrs of godly men againſt wicked invaders; juſtice may, and muſt be done, in warrs and otherwiſe, whatever be the ſouls eſtate of the ſufferer; that is to be referred to God, and is ſealed amongſt his ſecrets: yet, that there may be ſuch caſes, that (when need is) the preſervation of our own temporal life may be forborn, for the certain preſervation of the ſoul of another, ſeems agreeable to the cited Scripture.

5. Doth not the obligation to ſelf-defence ceaſe, (ſpeaking of ſelf-defence as to the temporal life) for the publick good and preſervation of the Common-wealth, or of the Head of the Common-wealth, the King? I know this Libeller jeers at a mans ſuffering, (under pretext of the good of the Common-wealth) intolerable and inevitable injuries) and ſayes, *It is but for the deluſion of an empty name, only for the luſts of others, really to deprive a mans ſelf of his whole ſhare and intereſt in the Common-wealth*, Pag. 15. Yet, better Divines then he a great deal, have concluded it as moſt rational, that a man is bound to ſuffer the greateſt extremity of death, rather then that for ſparing of his ſuffering, the Common-wealth, or Head of the Common-wealth, or main publick Perſon, ſhould ſuffer. Dr. *Ameſ. Caſ. Conſc. lib.* 5. *cap.* 31. *q.* 3. puts the caſe of a Tyrants invading a City, and threatning vaſtation to it unleſs one innocent perſon (whom he ſhould name) might be delivered to him; he reſolves, That the innocent perſon *tenetur jure naturali pro totius Reipublicæ ſalute ſe morti offerre*,

& Respublica potest eum neque retinere neque defendere, sed urgere eum ut officium suum hac in parte praestet. He accounts it the duty of the innocent person in that case, to offer himself to death for the safety of the whole Common-wealth; and by natural Right and Law he is bound to this, and the Common-wealth is not in this case bound to defend him. Certainly, this is far contrair to this mans Divinity; who will have none to suffer under pretext of the good of the Common-wealth, if they be innocent, (whether really or in their own eyes) *For why*, (sayes he) *that is for an empty name and lusts of others, to deprive a mans self of his share in the Common-wealth.* What then? if a man do lose his share in the Common-wealth and be found in the way of his duty, he is no loser, he gets a better share then that is. If a General command a Souldier, for the certain good of the Army, (upon the well-being whereof, the good of the Common-wealth depends) to go to such a part or post, where, in his own mind, he saw certain death tristing with him; would this Author teach the Souldier to say, *Shall I expose my self to certain death for an empty name of the good of Army and Common-wealth, and at the lust of the General, lose all my share and interest both in Army and Common-wealth? I will not do it; he offers me intolerable injury and inevitable in this injunction: it is a case like inflicting death upon me.*

6. It is agreed amongst the Learned, that self-preservation (as to temporal life) when it comes in competition with the preservation of the King or Head of the Common-wealth, or a publick Person most necessary to the Common-wealth, must cease and cede thereunto; as the Hand in the natural Body will be cast up (though it should be cut off) to hold off a deadly stroke from the Head, *Amesi. Cas. Consc. lib. 5. cap. 7. Thes. 14. In bonis temporalibus tenetur quisque personam publicam sibi ipsi praeferre, bonum enim totius plurus faciendum est, quam bonum alicujus partis.* And, *Lex Rex*, amongst many things wrong, hath this which is right, *Page 335. I think* (saith he) *that a private man should rather suffer the King to kill him, then that he should kill the King; because he is not to prefer the life of a private man to the life of a publick man.* Thus he rightly, (however inconsonantly to his other Doctrines.) If the case come to be, that the King is in manifest hazard of his life, and that I a private man must either lose my life, or he his life; my self-preservation must cease for the publick good, and I am to prefer his preservation to mine own. But this man sayes, *Self-defence* (the question now is about violent self-defence, as to the temporal life) *is a principal rule of righteousness,*

nesse, whereunto the great command of love to our neighbour, by Gods Law, is resolved, and whereby it is interpreted, P. 14. therefore it is to be preferred to all duties to men, according to this mans mind. True it is, there is a due order of our charity and love to men and our neighbours; and true love to our selves, is indeed the rule and measure of love to our neighbour: we are first to love our selves, and then our neighbour as our selves, (not as much, but as truly and sincerely; for it is not the quantity, but the quality of love, not equality but similitude of love to our neighbour, in proportion of that to our selves, that is required.) But it is untrue, that in the exercise of this love of our selves, in self-defence or preservation of our bodies, stands the principal rule of righteousness: For, there may be cases, (whereof some are pointed at) wherein a man is bound to prefer the preservation of others, to the preservation or defence of his own natural life; and yet in so doing, a man doth truly love himself more then others, in doing his duty to others, although with the loss of his own life and surceasing the defence of it, (*se magis diligit ad finem suum ultimum*, as the Schools speaks.) In following his duty toward others, and therein not defending his own life, he loves himself best, in regard of keeping the way to the enjoying of the universal and eternal good. *Amesius lib. 5. Consc. cap. 7.* saith well, *Quamvis vita mea sit mihi magis conservanda quam alterius vita per se non tamen quam alterius vita & mea virtus.* A man is rather bound to preserve another mans life in doing his own duty, then his own life simply, and in following his duty, he preserves his best life, though he lose the worst. But too many are so much upon self-defence and preservation of the natural life by any means, that in preserving their bodies, they destroy their souls; and so do not indeed love themselves so much and so orderly as they ought to do.

But the great knot of the question anent self-defence is this, whether meer private persons, one or moe, separatly or joyntly, when they are or think themselves unjustly afflicted, and extremly injuriously handled by the Magistrate, or Supreme Power, proceeding according to Laws agreed to, betwixt himself and the body of the Community? whither or not (upon supposition that these Laws are not just and right) may private persons defend themselves against the violence of the Magistrate thus proceeding, even by violent re-offending; yea, in order to their own defence, cut off the Prince or Magistrate whatsoever, or their Ministers and Officers standing in their way, or when they are punishing them and afflicting them according to Law? This is the

true ſtate of the Controverſie, at this time: and needleſs it were to run out upon what the two Martyrs (as *Naph.* calls them, Page 27.) *Lex Rex* (the Book might have been better termed *Exlex Exrex*) and the Apology hath ſet down tediouſly, touching *Scotlands* defenſive Arms, as they call them. What ſenſe the people of *Scotland* (when they have come to liberty) have of theſe arms, their late repreſentative hath declared; and it were to be wiſhed, that the memory of ſuch ways might be ſo buried, that the poſterity might never look upon them as exemplary; their progenitors have ſo deeply drunk of the bitter fruits of the ſame, the reſult of them having been ſo much ſin, ſhame and ſorrow, vaſtation, confuſion and deſtruction to Princes and People. This only ſhall be ſaid, that theſe Diſputes of defenſive Arms (in both theſe Martyrs) proceed (as upon their main foundation) upon moſt untrue and malitious miſrepreſentations of matters of fact; all or moſt of the Arguments run upon falſe Hypotheſes and bitter, untrue reflections on the late King. As if, 1. he had been the firſt invader of the Nation, whereas it is known, his Authority was firſt invaded, his Laws troden upon, his Proclamations openly deſpiſed, his Caſtles violently ſeiſed, illegal Tables and Courts ſet up, his Subjects, walking according to his Laws, perſecuted; his Arms he took, were not invaſive againſt the Nation, but defenſive of his own Authority, of his Laws and the perſons of orderly walking Subjects; and for reducing theſe who had ſtrayed from their duty. 2. They repreſent him in their virulent writings, as *Nerone ipſo neronior*, a great perſecutor of Religion, intending the total ruine and deſtruction of the Proteſtant Profeſſion, and the total ruine and deſtruction of the whole people of the Land; In a word, as the immaneſt and moſt conſummate Tyrant in the World (upon ſuch ſuggeſtions doth the plea for defenſive Arms go.) But the World knows, that that King lived and died a Proteſtant, and not one, either ignorant or formal, or profane (as too many alas are) but having great knowledge of the truth, ardent zeal for it, and being exemplarly devote, and to the great confuſion of his enemies, he laid down his life as a glorious Martyr for the true Religion of God, and Laws and Liberties of the people. If there was any thing that could not have a favourable Interpretation in that unhappy Book that gave the riſe to the troubles, how timely was it retired, and great ſatisfaction and ſecurity given for Religion? If through default of Miniſters of State, any thing had creeped in, that could not abide the teſt of Law, how willingly was it reformed? Yet, all could not ſiſt the begun courſe of violence, till, through Gods dreadful indignation againſt

ſinful

ſinful people, his fatal end might be brought on, not becauſe he had been a Tyrant, but becauſe he had not been ſuch.

But I am ſenſible of a digreſſion. The caſe now to be noticed is much different from what then was. Then the *Primores Regni* (upon miſtakes which ſince they have had opportunity to reſent) were unhappily engaged in oppoſition to the Soveraign: but now a Proclamation is made by this Libeller to all meer private perſons, (not having any Nobles and Magiſtrates amongſt them) to make inſurrections againſt all Magiſtrates from the higheſt to the loweſt, and againſt the plurality of the people (if they think themſelves in probable capacity) and what confidence will not deſperate men deſigning confuſion have? and not only ſo, but a liberty is given them by this man to pull all Magiſtrates out of their ſeats, to inſtall themſelves, and to puniſh Magiſtrates, who (as he ſayes) have forfeited their right by the abuſe thereof. If this Doctrine hath not a native tendency to the ruine and deſtruction of this Nation, and of all Nations where this evil ſeed ſhall take root, let them who are judicious declare.

That Magiſtrates have no power nor warrand from God to abuſe their Authority, or to oppreſſe and deal injuſtly, is a thing out of all queſtion, (they who do ſo, will make a ſad reckoning for it to the great Judge of all, here and hereafter.) But when the corruption of theſe who are in power, leads them to abuſe their Authority, either in making unjuſt Laws, or puniſhing according to theſe, the queſtion is, what is (in this caſe) the duty of meer private Subjects, whither they ſhould with violence oppoſe all Magiſtrates (under whom they are) from the higheſt to the loweſt, (together with the plurality of the Body of that Community whereof they are Members) yea; and in their own defence, deſtroy them all (if they be in probable capacity for ſuch work, and if they cannot eſchew this and preſerve themſelves) yea farther, if after they have ſubdued (Providence ſo permitting or ordering) all the Magiſtratical power and major part of the people, they may uſe a vindicative, avenging and puniſhing Power upon all? (being only perſons of private capacity) This (as will appear by this and the next Chapter) is the true ſtate of the queſtion at this time, as the Libeller in his Book hath ſtated it.

Upon the reſolution of this queſtion, this Advocate of the ſeditious Party ſhakes hands with many Papiſts (albeit ſome of the more Orthodox, are of a contrary opinion) aſſerting, That any perſon that is unjuſtly condemned or purſued, (or that thinks himſelf ſo dealt with, by the Magiſtrate or Judge, (whatever he be, Supreme or Subordinate)

may

may defend himself by Arms against the Judge or Magistrate, and his Officers and Ministers; even by slaying them, if he cannot otherwise escape: because, in that case, the Magistrate is an unjust Invader. And, it is lawful in that case, for a private man to kill the Magistrate, in order to his own defence, as it is to kill a Robber, or a Cut-throat invading a man, while he is going on in his Journey: Thus *Becan, Tom. 2. Controv. tractat. 3. quest. 8.* and *Swarez, contra Regem Anglia, Lib. 6. Cap. 4. S. 6.* where he asserts, a man unjustly invaded by the King, may kill him, if otherwise he cannot defend his own life; And *Thomas* in this went before them, 2ª 2ª *quest. 70. Art. 4. C.* but addes a caution, *licet resistere malis Principibus, nisi forte propter scandalum vitandum, cum ex hoc, aliqua gravis turbatio sequeretur.* But our Protestant Divines (who are deserted by this man and his complices) are of another spirit. Mr *Calvin* is plain, *Institut. Lib. 4. Cap. 20. S. 31. privatis hominibus nullum aliud, quam parendi & patiendi datum est mandatum,* (he supposes where there is not opportunity of flying or withdrawing, which is also a sort of suffering) and speaking of the tyrannies and oppressions of wicked Princes, 298. *Non nostrum est* (meaning of private men) *hujusmodi malis mederi, hoc tantum reliquum est, ut Domini opem imploremus.* Again, *S. 26.* speaking of 1 *Sam. 8. 11.* he expones it thus, that albeit Kings have no *jus*, or right to do Acts of Tyranny, yet, *vocatur jus in populum, cui parere ipsi necesse esset, nec obsistere liceret, eo se proripiet licentia Regum libido, quam cohibere vestrum non erit,* &c. And, *Art. 31. nobis summopere cavendum, ne illam plenam venerandæ majestatis magistratuum authoritatem, etiamsi apud indignissimos resideat, & qui eam sua nequitia quantum in se est polluunt; spernemus aut violemus.*

Accordingly, *Peter Martyr*, one of the most learned of our Protestants, *Loci com. class. 4. cap. 20. p. 680. Illi subjecti, qui tantum subjiciuntur, & omnino privati sunt adversus Principes & Dominos suos non debent incitari, ut eos è dignitate seu gradu suo deturbent, & quamvis probe noverim ab ethnicis præmia olim constituta* Τυραννοκτονοις, *attamen id respondi, quod pietas & sacra litera persuadent. Certe si populo sit fas Regno dejicere injuste Imperantes, nulli Principes & Reges usquam tuti erunt, quamvis enim probe & sancte regnant, non tamen populo satisfaciunt.* And, Page 684. *Improbum Principem pii homines, quando privati sunt & super illo jus non habent, ferant oportet, neque illorum est, seditiose adversus eum arma movere.* Again, speaking to private men, *Adversus Tyrannum non habes*

habes quod agas (except Prayers to God and Petitions to them in power) *nisi seditionem aut tumultum conspirationemve contra illum excites, aut ipse privata Authoritate interficias, quæ aliena sunt a sacrarum literarum sententia.* Again, Colum. 2. ibid. *quia potestas est à Deo, Tyrannis est ferenda.* Again, *solummodo ad Tribunal Dei est appellandum, cum non detur alia superior aut major potestas cui tuus Tyrannus pareat.* Again, *omnes pii hoc sibi persuasum habeant, exauthoratas esse eorum vires ad movendas in republica turbas, eo nomine quod vi aliquod facere velint adversus publicum Magistratum cujusvis formæ fuerit*; Thus, famous *Martyr.* So also *Andreas Rivet, in Decalog.* Page 233. *non est vera legis naturalis notitia sed depravatio ab humano & corrupto affectu movere seditionem contra injustam magistratus violentiam*: And, Page 235. approving their opinion, who say, a man should rather suffer death, then defend his own life, by destroying the Princes life, or bringing it in danger, (albeit he allow labouring to ward off our own destruction against unjust invasion,) yet if a man cannot deliver himself without destroying the Prince, he sayes, *si tamen evitari non possit malum quodlibet, quod hujus vitæ termino concluditur, præstat mortem oppetere quam fieri reum parricidii, id nos absolute sentimus de Parente & Principe*; adde *Dr. Ames. Lib.* 5. *Conscien. Cap.* 20. 4. *potestas & authoritas superioris, non magis potest consistere actu sine hac subjectione, quam relatum unum sine suo correlato; huic autem subjectioni omnis violenta insurrectio adversatur.* And, 6. he will have this subjection (contrary to violent insurrection, all sorts of which he holds out as unlawful) given even where obedience cannot be given: and, Page 319. *persona invadens potest esse talis, & alia etiam circumstantiæ ut magis invasum deceat mortem ipsam pati, quam tali defensione propulsare.* To these may be joyned moderate Papists; *Æstius, Lib.* 2. *in Sententias, cap. ult. privato nemini licet superiori etiam tyrannice imperanti resistere, multo minus è medio tollere. Tollet. Lib.* 5. *de instruct. sacerdotis, cap.* 6. *non licet cuiquam se defendere a Judice, vulnere vel pugna licet sit innocens.* Many moe might be cited: But it may be evident, that this Libellers doctrine of the lawfulness of private persons, one or moe resisting the Magistrate violently, with destroying him in self-defence, far more taking on them a vindicative and punishing power (of which in the following Chapter) is against the common sense of Protestant Divines, and of the sounder Papists also.

Whatever may be said, of moral or legal self-defence, against the Soveraign, by way of petition, or plea in Court, for safety of a mans

Person

perſon or Eſtate; And whatever may be ſaid of warding off and defenſively putting back perſonal injurious aſſaults, to the manifeſt and immediate peril of life; without any colour of deſerving, of Reaſon, of Law or judicial proceeding; or of a Womans violent reſiſting attempts, againſt the honour of her chaſtity, (dearer to her then life) and tending to enſnare her alſo in ſin againſt God (whereof her non-reſiſtance, makes her formaly guilty) And whatever may be done, in the caſe of moſt habited, notour and compleat tyranny, againſt all appearance of Law, manifeſtly tending to the deſtruction of the body of a people, or greater part thereof, by hoſtile furious actions, or in the caſe of violent attempts, of deſtruction of all known legal liberties, and the beeing of Religion, according to Law; or in the caſe of vendition, alienation of, and giving a whole Kingdom to forrainers or ſtrangers, or ſome ſuch like; What ever I ſay in ſuch horrid caſes, (which for moſt part, cannot befall a Prince, in his natural and right wits (a caſe wherein proviſion may be made, that he hurt not himſelf, nor his Dominions) may be done, comes not at all within the compaſſe of our queſtion; although moſt diſingenuouſly, the diſcontented and ſeditious, do ſtrive on all occaſions, to aggravate matters ſo, that the caſe concerning them, may ſeem co-incident with theſe or the like; that ſo they may juſtifie their violence againſt the powers. But the queſtion is, (as hath been ſaid) whether, when the Magiſtrate proceeds according to Law, agreed unto by himſelf and the body of the Community, (ſuppoſe upon the matter, it be *Lex male poſita*, or no right or juſt Law) may any part of the people, or meer private perſons, (who think themſelves in capacity ſo to do) offer violence to the Magiſtrate, or to his Miniſters and Officers, proceeding according to Law, or if they ought to ſubmit to puniſhment, (or elſe flee) if they cannot obey the præceptive part of the Law; being bound up, (as they ſay) in conſcience. As for private perſons, going out further to revenge wrongs done them on the Magiſtrate, or puniſhing them, that is to be ſpoken to hereafter: But this now is the true ſtate of the buſineſs, at this time, anent violent reſiſtance of the Magiſtrates; (all of them, from the higheſt to the loweſt, and of the whole body of the Nation) by any minor part of private perſons, who apprehend themſelves in capacity for that work.

It ought to be well conſidered, and it may be eaſily perceived, how Satan in theſe laſt and worſt of times, is mainly labouring to bring in confuſion into humane Societies; to raiſe ſcandals upon Religion, and to tempt and provoke the Princes of the World, to diſlodge the

Church

Church of God, out of their Dominions; because of the seditious Principles and unquiet Practices of some Professors thereof; (though Religion, is innocent as to these) which tend to the dissolution of the State-government; yea, and also, of all Church-government.

It is to be marked, that when *Lex Rex* had in several places (See Pag. 163. and, Pag. 313.) vented that Principle, in reference to the Civil Government: *That no Man is bound in Conscience to subjection passive, under unjust punishments, inflicted by the Magistrate, more then to active obedience unto unlawful Commands; and that passive obedience, under unjust Sentences, comes under no Command of God: Yea, that it is a sin against Gods Command, to be passively subject to an unjust Sentence; And that it is an act of Grace and Vertue, for a Man to resist the Magistrate violently, when he does him wrong, and a self-murther against the sixth Command, not to resist, when he offers to take the life without cause, though, not without Law*, pag. 314. 322. When, I say, these Doctrines were broached, in reference to the Common-wealth; they were very quickly translated, and applied to the Church, by this man and his party; who pleaded some years ago, very strongly (as they thought) for non-submission unto, and counteracting of, all the Judicatories of the Presbyterial Government, whensoever the persons injured, thought the Sentence wrong and unlawful; so that no excommunicate private person, ought to submit to the Sentence of any, or all the Judicatories, if he thought the Sentence wrong and unlawful; and no Minister should leave his Ministery, but continue acting in it, if he thought the Sentence of deposition, given against him by any, or all the Judicatories of the Church, unjust: And they cryed out, (if this might not be admitted for sound Doctrine) that Presbytery was turned into Papacy and absolute Tyranny; yea, they proceeded further then the point of counteracting, for the Agitators of the schimatical Party, would take upon them to possesse the power of the most eminent Church-judicatories, (they being the far minor Part) and did in that self-created capacity of Government, over all others, in this Church, act, (excluding others, who were the greater Part) thinking, that though they were the far lesser Part, yet being the founder, (in their own judgement) the Government and managing of it, belonged unto them; and not unto the corrupt plurality of Ministers, who behoved all to bow before them: And how well their Practices in the Church do homologate with their Practices as to the State (proceeding from one and the same Principle) we may now see. For it

is the way which they clearly own, that every private person, (when and so long as they are able, or are in probable capacity, to act violently against the Magistrate) ought to counter-act him violently, when he thinks the Magistrate wrongs him; (for this must be referred to every Mans private discretive judgement, as *Naphtali* tells us, pag. 148.) and nothing excuses from this violent resisting, but *quando desunt vires temporales*. No submission is to be expected from them, by Magistrates, (when they Govern not according to their mind) but when they cannot otherwise do; nor any submission Pious, or out of any Principle of Conscience, but prudential and politick, because they are not in probable capacity to give him Battel; if they had the tempting opportunity and capacity, the case would be altered: Then not only violent resistance should come to be duty, but pulling of the Magistrate out of his chair of Government, (as we will hear) punishing him, and placing themselves, though but private Men, in his room.

How contrary such principles and practices, of private Mens non-submission to, and counter-acting of, Church-judicatories, (supposed to do wrong) are unto the Word of God, how subversive of Church-government, how introductory of Schisme, Heresies and all Mischiefs into the Church, is well discovered by the learned Reviewer of the Pamphlet, intituled, *Presbytery* no *Papacy*, *Protesters* no *Subverters*: And with equal reason, may the same grounds be made use of, against this Mans inciting all private persons to counter-act the Magistrate violently; when they think he doth them wrong, or when they account their Sentences unjust. As certain confusion comes on the Church, if the Principles of that Party, be entertained; so, let People once drink in this Mans Doctrine, in reference to the State, there shall be no end of sedition, no security for the powers ordained by God; for, any private persons are made judges of the justice of the Magistrates Sentences and Punishments; (and what Man will readily condemn himself, if he may be admitted to be judge in his own cause?) And upon their own private judgement, of the injustice of the Magistrates dealing with them, are allowed, without any further prerequisite, to use violence against him; pull the sword out of his hand, and pull himself out of his seat; onely, there must be probable capacity for this, and nothing excuses from not doing so, but want of that capacity: If that be wanting, there must be submission to unjust Sentences; not out of any conscientious respect to the Power, but *ad redimendam majorem vexationem*. This is the Libellers mind.

Such

Such Doctrine surely is neither consonant to Gods Word, to the practices of his dear and approven People, to the mind of his soundest Servants, nor to sound Reason. Who ever will consult the holy Oracles of God, will find, that not only is obedience commanded to be given to Magistrates in their lawful injunctions, and submission, not only for wraths-sake, but also for conscience-sake, to their just punishments of sin and wickedness, (who ever re-offends or violently resists the Magistrate in either of these, no doubt resists the Ordinance of God, and receive to themselves damnation, *Rom.* 13. 2.) but also, that there is a submission required to be yielded them, even when they put us to suffer wrongfully and unjustly, may be evidently gathered from Scripture grounds; in the case of unjust suffering, God hath not left his people without direction what to do, in reference to Magistrates abusing their power.

It is true (as hath been said) the Lord hath not given a moral power or warrand to any invested with Authority, to do evil or unjustly; concerning that the question is not: But the question is, what duty is owed, by the Subject, unto the Magistrate, (especially the Supreme; for, there may be remedies had against the injuries of the inferior by appellation) in case of his male-administration and unjust Laws, or Sentences according to these Laws, or Executions according to Sentence; whether they may violate or violent the person invested with Authority, and not submit to him, but counter-act him by force in self-defence against his violence: or, if they be bound in conscience, or by any Law of God, to submit humbly to what he inflicts, (although unjustly) if they can neither move him by their humble petitions to forbear them, nor can flee from his wrath, or go out of his Dominions. This man and his Complices maintain, that if the Magistrate abuse his power in making unjust Laws, or punishing according to these; any private man or company of men, that think themselves strong enough for the Magistrate, ought never to suffer, but use forcible resistance against the Magistrate abusing his power; and that all the patience that is required of Christians, toward oppressing Magistrates, is only to bear suffering patiently when they are out of capacity of acting, and may not better do; and to suffer patiently, when they see they cannot repress the violence of the unjustly-dealing Magistrate with a sufficient contrary violence. This Doctrine, savouring so strongly of carnal selfie-nature, and being too suitable to the way of beasts, who know no other thing but to be carried with a natural *impetus* to repay violence with violence till they be over-powered, we utterly dislike, and do

assert, according to the Holy Scriptures, That even when Magistrates deal unjustly, or put any to suffering wrongfully, (albeit they are for this to give a dreadful account, and albeit Subjects are to judge of their actions as they deserve, and not approve their malversation, but modestly witness against it, as there is opportunity) yet, suffering persons are bound to a passive submission or obedience, enduring wrongs done to them not only with respect to Gods providential Ordinance, (by which their suffering comes to pass) but with respect to his institutive Ordinance of Magistracy, wherewith the persons afflicting them are invested, (albeit in the particular acts concerning them, abusing their power) For, albeit the abuse of the power be not of God, yet the abused power is of God; and the person invested therewith must have respect from the sufferer, (other respect then is to be given to a private invader) *intuitu officii*, not *intuitu abusus officii*; and this respect is patient submission under the affliction, though unjustly inflicted; and not daring to re-violent the person invested with Magistratical power (although in a particular toward us he abuse his power) to commit our persons and our cause to him that judgeth righteously, not offering to move sedition, albeit we were able for it. If we shall only look to these three things in the Scripture, we shall see ground for what is said.

1. Consider what is required of Children toward their Parents unjustly afflicting them, and likewise from Servants toward their Masters; and by analogy we may learn somewhat of the mind of God, of the duty of Subjects to their Princes, who are their political Fathers, and have a despotical and lordly power over them. For Children, *Heb.* 12. 9, 10. *We had Fathers of our flesh, who corrected and chastned us after their own pleasure, and we gave them reverence*; which in the apodosis of the similitude, is expon'd *subjection*, *v.* 9. This is not only spoken of *narrativè* but *approbativè* (if it were not so, the argument taken from our carriage to Parents to enforce reverent subjection to God, were not good.) The Apostle approves the reverend subjection of Children to their Parents, though unreasonably and with mixtures of unjust passion correcting them: he allows not the deed of the Parent for his own pleasure afflicting the Child, but allows the reverend subjection of the Child under such unreasonable and unjust dealing. So, 1 *Pet.* 2. 18. *Servants, be subject to your Masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully*, &c. *v.* 20. *If when ye do well and suffer for it,*

ye

ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God: For even hereunto were ye called. No Master had a moral power or warrand from God to afflict his servant wrongfully, (that was not acceptable to God, but displeasing to him) yet, that Servants should endure a suffering lot in, and for, following their duty to God, with subjection to their Masters afflicting them, and that from a principle of conscience toward God, was a thing acceptable to God. And hereunto were Servants then called; it is not only subjection to patient suffering for their faults they were called to, nor only subjection to endure suffering in well-doing, meerly out of prudence, or because they could not help it, not being in probable capacity to violent their Masters though they would; but a subjection to endure wrongful sufferings from their hands, from a principle of conscience toward God moving them to regard their authority, albeit abused by putting them to grievous trouble wrongfully.

And though, perhaps, they will say, there is great difference between respects due by Children to their Parents, and Servants to their Lords and Masters, and that which is due by Subjects to Kings, (the King neither having properly paternal, nor yet despotick nor lordly power over his Subjects.) And they will say also, there is great difference between the evils spoken of in these Texts, to be endured by Children or Servants, corrections, buffetings, *&c.* and that irreparable loss of life, wherein (should it come to that) subjection without resistance is pressed to the wrongful Sentences and Proceedings of the Magistrate or Prince. Though, I say, they will, and do assert this, to show the disparity of the cases; yet, 1. There is a full parity and agreement of these relative Powers, Paternal, Masterly and Magistratical or Royal, in this, that in the inflicting of evils upon those who are under them, (such as are competent to them to inflict within their sphere) a patient, reverend subjection is due from their inferiours, (without violent insurrection against them) even when they abuse their power in some particulars, not in way of justification or respect to the abuse, but in a humble conscientious regard of their being invested with that power they do abuse. 2. Kings are not Fathers of our flesh, or by generation, nor can they be truly called so, (political and parental power are different things, although they may be co-incident in one and the same subject, as most probably they were in the first political Governments that were in the world). Yet, as Kings and Magistrates should have fatherly hearts to their Subjects, (they being a sort of official Fathers to them to procure their good, and to defend them from evil, every

King

King should be *Abimelech*, *i.e.* my Father King) So Subjects ought to have such hearts to their King, as Children have to their Father, giving them special reverence, subjection and obedience from their very soul and inward affections; and although sometimes they are not such as they should be, yet they ought to account their persons (sealed with Gods Ordinance and the Image of his Soveraignty) sacred and inviolable, resolving to suffer any thing of them, rather then to be guilty of parricide, (although under the colour of self-defence.) Gods Law, in the fifth Command, hath injoyned reverence and subjection to Princes, under the title of Parents; *Calvin*, *lib.* 4. *inst. cap.* 8. shews, the end of that Command is (under the name and title of Parents, Father and Mother) to shew us, that all the degrees of eminency God hath ordered to be over us, should be inviolable; *Oportere nobis esse inviolabiles, quia omnium est eadem ratio.* God (saith he) under the name of the most amiable relations of Father and Mother, leads us to subjection to all Superiors: *Hoc* (saith he) *de subjectione praeceptum cum humani ingenii pravitate valde pugnat* (*quod ut est celsitudinis appetentia turgidum aegre se subjici sustinet.*) Therefore (he adds) to commend this subjection, he hath communicate his own name to them who are in eminency, *In unum ipsum* (saith he) *ita conveniunt, patris Dei ac Domini tituli, ut quoties unum aliquem ex istis audimus, Majestatis illius sensu animum nostrum ferire oporteat, quos ergo istorum facit participes*, &c. S. 35. These whom God makes sharers in these stiles, he illustrates them with some sparkle of his own glory, that they may all appear in their places conspicuous and reverend: We ought to think, that he that is a Father to us, *habet aliquid divini*; for, he carries not a divine title without cause; he that is a Prince or a Lord, *habet nonnullam cum Deo communionem*: Thus he. And, as he adds further, we are not to doubt but God is in this Command setting down an universal rule, touching Superiors, *nec interest* (saith he) it is not concerning to consider whether they who are to be thus honoured by us, be worthy or unworthy; for whatsoever they be, they have not attained to such emineney without Divine Providence, *Cujus ratione ipse Legislator illos honorari voluit.* So that whatsoever reverence and subjection a man is to give to to this natural Father, (when he inflicts punishments that are within his sphere) that same subjection and reverence is to be yielded to the Magistrate that beareth the Sword, punishing in his capacity, albeit, perhaps, he erre in his procedure, as Parents may do. 3. It shall not be asserted, that there is no difference, between a Royal or

Magistratical

Magistratical power, and that which is called dominative and masterly; seing, (besides other differences) they do mainly differ in this, that the Master or Lord of Slaves, hath his own profit mainly before his eyes, (which he may under Gods glory lawfully have) but the profit of his Slaves onely secondarily; and also, in order to his own good, which is maintained, by their well doing. But a King or Magistrate, should think, that his power is primarily ordinated to the publick good of the community it self, and only secondarily and consequently to the good of himself; it being proficable for him, that the Commonwealth should flourish. 2. In this, that a dominative and masterly power (such as was of old in use, and under which, people were made Slaves, either having their lives spared in a just War, and quitting their liberty to spare their lives; (*serva & serviam*) or being sold and bought, by the possessors money, (which was no way, like the condition of our hired servants, free to go off when they will) did interest these, who were invested with it, with a greater power over the bodies and goods of these, who were either sold Slaves, or saved in War, (and parting with their liberty, for saving their lives) then a Magistratical or Kingly power, ought to claim over subjects, not of such a condition, (albeit cruelty should be, according to Divine Law, avoided by any invested with any of these powers.) 3. In that the person that hath domination or Masterly power, (as was ordinarily of old (albeit we have scarce a shaddow of that power, which Masters then had over Slaves absolutely, surrendring their liberty to them) hath the Slaves in subjection to him, more out of fear and constraint, then love or deligbt; but a King or Magistrate hath his inferiours under him, in a civil, free, liberal, voluntary and loving subjection; knowing, that in the Government, their good is aimed at by the Ruler, more then his own; and his subjects will not, (or ought not) for his good and honour, which is inseparably connexed with their own good, spare to expend Life and Fortunes, or what they are or have, as publick necessity requires. Yet, though there be these differences, betwixt the Dominative or Masterly, and the Royal or Magistratical Power, the inferiors subjection in suffering, (even wrongfully, if God permit in his Providence the power to be so abused) is no lesse under the one Power, then under the other, by vertue of Divine Law. Subjects are Sons to the Soveraign, (their Father, and Nurse-father to the Church of God) but they are also Sons, that do under God serve him, (though they be not Slaves.) It is ordinary in Scripture, not only to find conquered People called Servants to the

Conqueror,

Conqueror, as, 2 *Sam.* 8. 14. they of *Edom*, became *Davids* servants, but also, ordinary Subjects to Kings were called Servants to them (not only their menial Servants, nor only their Guard, nor their Officers onely; but generally their Subjects were called Servants, and the King their Lord, as *Davids* Subjects, warring against the *Ammonites*, 2 *Sam.* 11. 24. are called his Servants, 1 *Kings* 12. 4. *We will serve thee*, saith *Israel* to *Rehoboam*, *i. e.* we will be Subjects to thee; Subjects, for the publick good, the Honour of the Prince, (whom they term, their Soveraign Lord) and for every ones private good, are Servants to the Prince in a free, voluntary, ingenuous, loving way; they are his Servants, as willingly and chearfully subordinate to him, as their Soveraign, although he also be in a sense, their Servant, (not in relation of an inferiour to his superiour, for so the Magistrate is only the Minister of God for the Peoples good, and never called their Minister) but in relation of the meanes to the end, he is their Servant, as Angels are ministering Spirits, for the heirs of Salvation: And Ministers of Christ, are Ministers and Servants to the People, though in regard of their official power, they are not subject to the People; but rules over them, according to Christs Gospel.

Thus we see subjection, without violent resistance, in case of wrongful suffering, is the duty of all inferiours toward their several correlatives; Neither hath it any weight to make disparity of the cases, the sufferings to which Children or Servants are to submit without violent resistance, as but corrections or buffetings, not tending to death or mutilation; but the subjection required to the Magistrate who bears the Sword, (when he abuseth the same) imports suffering death, (if he proceed so far) which is the greatest evil of punishment, and which is not eligible where lawful self defence is at hand. For, 1. the grounds that such men go upon for private persons violent resisting the Magistrate, (*viz.* the abuse of his power) if they hold good, will as effectually evince a non-subjection and violent resistance to Parents, Masters, *&c.* abusing their power, (which is contrary to the Scripture) and if the abuse of power by Fathers or Masters, warrands not violent resistance against them; how should it warrand the same against the Magistrates unjust violence? 2. As death is not, so no punishment unjustly inflicted is eligible, where lawfully it can be warded off: But this is the state of the question, if private persons may lawfully violent the Magistrate abusing his power? If in greater evils unjustly inflicted, there is alwayes a liberty for infe-

Lex Rex, p. 312.

riors

riors violently to re-offend the Powers above them; why not in leſſe evils too, theſe gradual differences of inflicted evils cannot make ſuch variation in the point of duty, ſeing the ground holds equally ſtrong; if a man may reſiſt the Magiſtrate for abuſe of his Power, he may do ſo alſo againſt his Father or Maſter on the ſame ground, and if he may not ſo deal with them, he may not deal ſo with the Magiſtrate neither.

Again, our Lord and Saviour did foreſee and foretell his Diſciples, that they were to meet with perſecution from the Powers of the world for truth and righteouſneſſe ſake. And, *Mat.* 5. 10. pronounceth them bleſſed, who are perſecuted for righteouſneſſe ſake, and who are perſecuted and reviled falſly for his ſake, aſſerting, that their reward is great in Heaven, So, 1 *Pet.* 4. 14. *If ye ſuffer for righteouſneſs ſake, happy are ye,* &c. v. 17. *It is better ye ſuffer for well doing, then for evil doing,* &c. In ſuch Texts, there is a commended ſuffering for Chriſt and righteouſneſs ſake, having the encouragement of a promiſe of reward (conſequently it muſt be a ſort of commanded ſuffering, ſeing God commends, and rewards nothing but what he commands) it is a ſuffering contradiſtinct from ſuffering for evil doing: ſubmiſſion to ſuffering for evil doing, is out of all queſtion a duty, becauſe in that caſe, the reſiſtance is a ſinful reſiſting of the Ordinance of God, and of theſe who are inveſted with that Ordinance of Magiſtracy while they lawfully uſe it. But there is a further matter commended or enjoyned in theſe Scriptures, even a cleanly ſubmiſſion to ſuffering in, and for well doing, (when God in his Providence permits Rulers ſo to abuſe their power) which paſſive ſubjection or ſubmiſſion, is not grounded on the Rulers abuſe of his Power through his corrupt will, but upon the peculiar command of God enjoyning ſubmiſſion in ſuch caſes, to prevent ſedition and confuſion.

The Author of *Lex Rex*, *queſt.* 30. jeers at paſſive obedience, as a chimæra, a ſa dream, and as involving a contradiction: And he thinks he ſpeaks acutely in ſaying, God never gave to any a command to ſuffer for well-doing, nor at all to ſuffer, (ſuffering depending on the free will of another without us, and not on our own free-will, and ſo not falling under any command of God to us) but he reaſons very ſophiſtically, inferring, that becauſe meer ſuffering, which neceſſarily depends on the action of another, is not commended to us, therefore ſubjection to ſuffering or paſſive obedience is not commanded when the Magiſtrate inflicts ſuffering. It is impoſſible indeed, that meer paſſion (as to be whipped, to be hanged or headed) ſhould be the object of an affirmative or

preceptive command of God (though the Magistrate may have a command to inflict these) but subjection to the passion, may fall under a command, and this is called passive obedience, which implyes more then meer passion or suffering; even a disposition and motion of the heart to lye under that lot with an eye to God, whose ordinance is used upon the sufferer. Only it is called passive obedience, because as to the precise suffering the punishment, there is no external action done, enjoyned by the Law or Command of the Magistrate (as there is in active obedience) although there be some dispositive or preparatory actions in order to suffering (not inferring a direct co-operation to a mans own suffering) which he may and ought to do, as going to a Gallows on his own feet, or up a Ladder, or laying down his head on a Block that it may be strucken off. It is an error to say, that such passive obedience is not commanded of God, but only the *modus rei*, that it be done patiently and christianly, when it cannot be by force avoided. For it is clear, that passive obedience, or submission and subjection to suffering (where the Magistrate hath just cause to inflict the punishment) falls under a command of God (that same command that forbids resisting the Magistrate in doing his duty, enjoyns submission and passive obedience to him, although we were able by force to deliver our selves out of his hand.) In conscience we are bound not to offer him violence in doing his duty, though there were power in our hand so to do, so that it is not only *modus rei* that in this case is commanded, (*viz.* that we suffer patiently in a christian way, when it cannot be avoided) but *res ipsa*, that we submit to the suffering, if there be no occasion of flying, without using force against him. Besides, that in this case, Christian patience and violent resistance are incompatible, there can be no Christian patience opposite to Christian submission and subjection to the Powers ordained by God doing their duty. But, if it might stand with violent resistance, it should be opposite to this Christian submission. Therefore, it appears to be a groundless assertion, that no passive obedience or submission to suffering is under a command. For, it is clear there is a command for this subjection we have spoken of.

But then the difficulty is, if passive obedience to unjustly punishing Powers fall under any commandment of God, or if there be any command of submission to cleanly suffering; it is this mans mind, so long as there is any power of violent and forcible resisting, a man is guilty of self-murther, who will not (in this case as well as in the former, and the former as well as this) endeavour the preservation of his own life, by fighting and resisting, and re-offending, and all that is required is,

(when

(when he is overpowered) then to use Christian patience in bearing affliction. But we assert, that a private person, though wrongfully afflicted by the lawful Magistrate, proceeding according to Law (let it be so that it is *Lex male posita*, or an evil Law) is bound not only to Christian patience in suffering (to this he is obliged in suffering from any private wicked hand, or from the hand of a manifest Usurper or Intruder in Magistracy, whose violence he may repell by violence, so long as he can) but unto a submission without repelling of violence by violence, and that in conscientious respect to the Ordinance of God, wherewith the lawful Magistrate is invested (although abusing it in this particular) and with a tender regard to the prevention of seditions and confusions in humane Societies, which are unavoidable; if every one, as he thinks himself wrong'd, shall be allowed to use force upon the lawful Magistrat's proceeding by Law, the greatest Malefactors being ready to justifie themselves, and to violate the justest Magistrates in their just proceedings; if once this repelling the Magistrat's force be allowed as a duty. And, no tender-hearted Christian is there, who will not rather submit without resistance to his own private suffering, commending his soul and cause to God, then by such evil and scandalous doctrines, open a wide gap for all wicked seditious persons to work confusion in the Common-wealth, and to overthrow the best and justest Magistrates. Mr. *Burroughs*, an Independent, writing on the 1. of *Hos.* 10. *v.* hath said well to this purpose: *When* (saith he) *things are brought into a Law, suppose the Authority be abused, and there be an evil Law made; then I confess, if the Law be in force, we must either quite our selves of the Countrey, or else submit and suffer; when it comes to be a Power or a Law, it is Authority, though abused, and we must yeeld obedience to it, either actively or passively.* This is sound and Orthodox; and it were well, others would homologate this Doctrine, to prevent the scandals of sedition and rebellion, which this tender-hearted Libeller speaks of very slightingly, striving to introduce Libertinisme, and to abolish the sense of these sins: *For* (sayes he) Napth. Page 39. *Treason, sedition and disorder are but formalities and notions, pretended to palliate and colour the Kings usurpation.*

But to add no more from the Scripture, that known passage, *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. *&c.* with 1, *Pet.* 2. 11. makes for this submission and subjection, which is pleaded for, by us; For, such subjection is there commanded to the powers then existing, or in being ὄντας ἐξουσίας (such as were *Caligula, Nero, Domitian*, monstruous tyrants, enemies and persecutors of

Gods people) as is opposed to αντιτασσεσθαι, to stand in order against them (the word is from ταξις, a military term) every Soul is commanded to be subject, or to stand in order under them, ὑποτασσεσθω, and forbidden to be αντιτασσομενος, to stand in military order against them, either defensive or offensive; by powers which are not to be resisted, are clearly meant, the persons in power, as the Apostle after expones himself, 3. and 4. vers. calling them Rulers, and the Ministers of God, he meanes undoubtedly certain *suppositi*, and persons invested with power; And cannot mean the abstract Ordinance of God, Magistracy or Power in the abstract; for, it can neither be said to exist (separate from persons) nor to be the subject and recipient of duties enjoyned to be payed to the Power, nor of the offences forbidden; nor can it be an Agent or Administrator of these Acts attributed to the Power, as to bear the Sword, to be the Minister of God, to praise the good or terrify the evil. So that of necessity, by Power is meant Power in the Concrete, or the person invested with the Power, who is not to be violently resisted, by private persons under him, (when he is acting according to Law, suppose the Law be judged by private men, not just) which is the present case of private persons resistance to Authority. The person of the King, because invested with power, official power, (though in a particular act abused) is not to be violated, nor violence offered to it by private men; a subjection, excluding violent resistance is commanded, and no such exception is put in, that if he abuse his power, or if we be strong enough for him, we are loosed from that subjection, and are at liberty for resisting him, and no submission is required under his abuse of his power, so long, as we can violently act against him. It is said, by those of the other judgement, that even by this same text, *Rom.* 13. subjection, or submission to unjust suffering by these invested with power, is not commanded, nor resistance in that case forbidden; for, all the subjection commanded to be given to persons in power, is onely, so far as they manage their power lawfully, according to Gods Ordinance, and as the Ministers of God, for our good, who are for the praise of well-doers, and the terror of evil-doers: And all the resistance forbidden, is onely, that they be not resisted while they do their duties; but, when they do not their duties, or do contrary to duty, in afflicting the innocent; they are not powers ordained of God, *pro tanto*, nor his Ministers for good to people; not, is resistance to them in such acts unlawful resistance to the ordinance of God, nor to them as the Ministers God; but, onely resistance to them as sinful men, serving their own lusts and

Sathan;

Sathan; their evil-doing, is no ordinance of God, but of Sathan. So that in effect, they think subjection here commanded and resistance forbidden, doth only relate to Magistrates, *quatenus & quamdiu bene se gesserint*, when and so far as they carry themselves rightly in Government; but that from this Text no submission is due to them, no resistance to them is forbidden in their inflicting unjust punishments; but that for any thing said here, Subjects may make insurrections against them whenever they think they do wrong, even any part of private Subjects against all Magistrates of all degrees, the Supreme as well as the Subordinate: So *Naphtali* teacheth, and borrows this out of his poisoned Fountain, *Lex Rex*.

But as to this, 1. It hath been often granted, and still is, that no man nor Magistrate on earth hath a moral power, commission or command from God to do evil, or to afflict any unjustly. 2. The question is not concerning the Magistrat's duty, but anent the Subjects duty, in case, through the permission of Divine Providence, the Magistrate abuse his place and power in unjust afflicting the innocent; whether the private Subject may use violence against, or upon, the Magistrate; or should rather then so do, submit to suffering (though unjustly) not for reverence to the abuse of the power, but in reverence to God, whose Ordinance the power (which is abused) is. It may be easily seen, that subjection to the power (opposite to resistance) is all alongs injoyned, whether the power be rightly used or otherwise: if it be rightly used, subjection without refusing active obedience is required; if it be not rightly used, subjection without resistance, violent or forcible repelling of the power is required, upon this formal reason and ground: Because, even when the power is abused, it remains a power ordained by God, (although the abuse of it be not ordained) even as a mans eye remains his eye, although sometimes it is not rightly used. The formal reason of the subjection and non-resistance pressed, is not the right use of the power, but because it is a power ordained of God (however perverted in the use by man.) And although the spirit of God, in describing the Magistrate, saith, *He is the minister of God for thy good, A praiser of the good, and a terror to the evil*; it is not meant, that that is the formal reason of subjection to him (in the full latitude of subjection) nor that the Magistrates then existing and in being, to whom the people are commanded to be subject, and forbidden to resist them, were such *de facto* in all their actings (or that all others, in reference to whom the direction may be after extended, should in time coming be such in all their actings) but only it is told, what the Magistrate is *ex officio*,

and

and what he ſhould be *de jure*, as it is ordinary in Scripture, that qualifications of Kings ſpoken of, do not *de facto* agree to them all, though they ſeem to be ſpoken aſſertively of all; onely it is ſhewed what they ſhould do *de jure*, as, *Prov.* 14. 35. *Pro.* 16. 10. 12. 13. 15. *Pro.* 22. 11. So here, the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the power, or perſon inveſted with power, calling him *the miniſter of God for thy good; no terror to good works, but evil; A praiſer of the good*, &c. ſhews only what a Magiſtrate ſhould be *ex officio*, and what he is *de jure*; but layes not this as the ground of ſubjection and non-reſiſtance to him, but this, that he is a Superior Power ordained of God: If he abuſe his place, he is to anſwer to God for it; but the abuſe of the power in a particular, doth not nullifie the power, or make it no power; if he do evil, he doth it not as inveſted with authority from God, yet he abides inveſted with authority: it cannot be ſaid he hath no authority, when he abuſes authority; ſubjection of one ſort or another is due to him, becauſe he is *in officio*, not becauſe he abuſeth his Office. To this purpoſe, amongſt many things wrong, *Lex Rex* hath that true word, Page 325. *We are* (ſaith he) *to ſuffer evil of puniſhment of Tyrants, ſome other way and in ſome other notion, then we are to ſuffer evil of equals: for, we are to ſuffer evil of equals, not for any paternal authority they have over us, as certainly we are to ſuffer evil of Superiors:* Thus he. And this is all we require, to ſuffer evil of the Magiſtrate or Superior, without violating his perſon upon the account of his paternal authority, which (though in a particular abuſed *hic & nunc*) remains the Ordinance of God: And in a reſpective reverence to that Ordinance wherewith they are inveſted, we are humbly to ſuffer wrong from them (if we cannot by petitions move their forbearance) neither juſtifying in our conſciences the wrong which they do to us, nor judging them to have a commiſſion from God, as to this wrong doing, but regarding both Gods Providence and Gods Ordinance in their perſons, which ceaſeth not to be his, although abuſed in a particular act toward us.

This hath been the common ſenſe of the generation of Gods children, before this fiery iron age, whoſe ſober examples, tenderly reſpecting Gods Ordinance and the ſtanding of humane Societies, are with us of a great deal more weight and more worthy imitation, then the furious practices of any of late, whereunto they have been inflamed by the Doctrines of popular Paraſites and fierce Demagogues, ſuch as this Libeller and his Complices are. The ancient Chriſtians, who lived neareſt the light of the Apoſtolick times, and had hearts fuller of zeal

(through

(through the recent warmth of the ſhed blood of Chriſt, and of his glorious extraordinary Ambaſſadors) then we in this frozen age have, knew not, owned not, any ſuch Doctrines of violent reſiſtance to Magiſtrates, as the new ſort of Chriſtians have made a main Article of their Faith. In *Tertullians* time, they wanted not abundant power and might to raiſe armes, and manage war againſt their perſecuting enemies, as he very plainly ſhews, *Apolog. cap.* 37. and, *ch.* 1. *ch.* 33. They were certainly in a probable capacity to have combined in armes againſt their perſecuting Emperors; and to have carried their will by force, and taken order with theſe who were over them and did oppreſs them, (as this Libeller allows all perſons of the moſt private place, if they be ſtrong enough to deal with the powers above them) yet they would never entertain a thought of any ſuch matter, let be to attempt it; they were never (although defamed as enemies to *Severus*, Emperor at that time) found amongſt the ſeditious, *Nunquam tamen Albiniani, vel Nigriani, vel Caſſiani*; never were they followers of ſeditious Leaders, *Apol. c.* 33. Although they had filled all their Cities, their Camps, their Courts, and the Empire every where full of Chriſtians; yet, they made conſcience of making inſurrection, they knew not ſuch a thing that the Word of God, and laws of Humanity and Chriſtian Charity, oblieged them (as now it is pleaded) to take arms againſt their Emperors, and to combine againſt them for mutual defence againſt their perſecutions, and for violent taking order with them. Were the antient Chriſtians ſo utterly ignorant, or ſo void of humanity and of Chriſtian love and zeal, that having more then probable capacity, they would ſuffer their Brethren be put to ſuffer, and not offer violence to the Magiſtrate in ſuch courſes, and reſcue the oppreſſed out of their hands? (either they were not knowing and loving Chriſtians, or elſe we have catched an error in our heads that is not Chriſtian, and a fire in our hearts that is not from above.) If we look forward to *Cyprians* time (long after *Tertullian*, though in that ſame age) he is free to tell us, in *Epiſtola ad Demetrianum*, when Chriſtians were grown very numerous, beyond what *Tertullian* ſaw them to have been; *Nemo noſtrum*, &c. not one of us offers to reſiſt your violence (ſpeaking of, and to, Pagans) or to revenge it, *Etiamſi nimius & copioſus ſit populus noſter.*

Yea, after that the great *Conſtantine* had owned Chriſtian Religion, and by his Authority (ſo far as it could reach) legally eſtabliſh'd it; ſo that now Religion became to be a legal right by Cæſarean Edicts and Laws, and multitudes embracing it, (as uſeth to be when examples

of

of religious Princes go before) ſo there is no doubt, Chriſtians were both for number and power able to hold their own Religion by force againſt all contrary Powers, and that upon the ground of legal humane right, as well as divine. Yet, when the Arian Emperors *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, *&c.* and *Julian* the Apoſtate perſecuted them for Religion, they never attempted ſuch a thing, as to make head againſt them, and to combine for a reſiſtance, albeit they wanted neither the legal right of humane Imperial Law for it, nor phyſical Power ſufficient againſt the Apoſtate and Arian Emperors, *nec deerat jus humanum*, *nec deerant vires temporales*, yet there was never the leaſt attempt made by Chriſtians in theſe times againſt their Emperors apoſtatizing, turning heretical and cruel Perſecutors. No other remedy did Chriſtians then know againſt perſecuting Powers, but prayers and tears to God and Man, with patience in ſuffering for Chriſt; albeit they had arms in their hands, they knew not how to uſe the ſame againſt the Powers above them. When that vile Perſecutor *Maximian* was raging againſt Chriſtian Profeſſors, *Anno* 297. He had under him a whole Legion of Chriſtian Souldiers (called the *Theban Legion*) conſiſting of ſix thouſand ſix hundred and ſixty ſix armed men, who had ſtrength and power enough to ſell their lives dear to any that would ſeek the ſame. Yet, rather then they would offer violence to the wicked Emperor or his Officers, they did lay aſide their weapons, and ſuffer'd themſelves, for Chriſts ſake, to be ſlain by the executors of the Commands of that cruel Tyrant. And it is known by the Hiſtory, that the plurality of the Army under *Julian* the Apoſtate were Chriſtians, (as appeared by their joynt Proclamation and Declaration, at the entry of *Jovinian* his Succeſſor (*Nos Chriſtiani ſumus*) yet never did they make head againſt the Apoſtate, nor violent him in his courſes againſt Religion, and their Brethren the Profeſſors thereof. Ohſilly, fooliſh and feminine Chriſtians then! who neither knew to uſe the priviledge of ſelf-defence againſt Magiſtrates for themſelves, nor how to combine for the aid of others, and were ſo deſtitute of reaſon for themſelves, and humanity and religious charity toward others; that neither the Paganiſme, Apoſtaſie, Arianiſme of the Emperors, nor Perſecution of Brethren by them, could move them to ſuch ways of violent and bloody reſiſtance of Powers (though they did indeed reſiſt to blood, ſtriving againſt ſin, as *Heb.* 12. 4.) But, O! how illuminated maſculous and martial are the ſpirits of Chriſtians now a dayes, and how full of charity one to another, as well as of zeal to God, that any number of private perſons are allowed (if they can carry on the buſineſs without a

ſeen

seen mischief to themselves) to take the Sword against all Magistrates whom they account oppressors of them (though falsly) to combine in bands against them, to pull them out of their seats, to revenge upon them the injuries done to themselves or their Brethren, and to punish them condignly; yea, it is counted high impiety against God, and want of Christian charity, to omit this. This is the clear doctrine of this Libeller and his Complices (as hath in part, and will further appear.) And what shall we say to it? (I will say, *anima mea sit cum animabus veterum Christianorum*) shall we think, that they were generally so ignorant, senseless and stupid, that they knew not what belonged to their duty toward God, themselves or their Brethren? Wanted they the light to know their duty, the zeal to Gods glory, the Christian love to brethren, which we have so abundantly, that moves us to resisting of Powers, and did not them? *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.* But the truth is this, as in the fear of God they refused to give active obedience to any evil command of Powers above them, so when they could neither mitigate the fury of persecuting powers by Petitions, nor in Gods Providence find a way of escaping out of their Dominions and flying (which is no resistance, albeit the pair of Pseudomartyrs have brought forth this Monster of a stoical Paradox, that flying from the Magistrate, is resistance to him, whereas it is only a withdrawing from under his Dominion, and putting ones self under another Dominion, where his Power reaches not: and so by flight and withdrawing from the Kingdoms, the man ceaseth to be a Subject to him, whose Subject he was, and comes to be under other Lords and Laws.) But, I say, when Christians could neither by Petitions nor Apologies allay the fury of Persecutors, nor escape from them, in the fear of God commanding submission to his Ordinance (although in the use perverted as to them) they (having light enough to know their duty, great zeal for Christ, great love to their brethren, sufficient power to have overpowered their enemies) did notwithstanding, without violent resistance or combinations to that end against Powers, meekly lay down their lives for Christ; and chooseed rather to suffer then resist. Herein their practice is a better Commentary of *Rom.* 13. and, 1 of *Pet.* 2. then all seditious glosses: And, is preferable for imitation to all the contrary actings of men, in these dregs of time.

Some go about to question the truth of *Tertullians* narration, concerning the number and power of Christians in his time; asserting, that onely their weakness excused them from the sin of non-resistance to their Magistrates. But, it is strange to think, that *Tertullian* in an

Apology made to the Gentiles for Christians, should assert so gross an untruth in matter of fact, concerning these of his Religion, whereof his enemies (if they could) would no doubt take advantage. And as strange it is, that any now living, should after thirteen or fourteen hundred years, take on them to know the number and power of Christians in *Tertullians* time, better then he did; also to say, that in *Julians* Army, the Christians were not the prevailing and greater part, is contrary to the truth of the story, as appears by their cry, at the reception of *Jovinian* (whereof before) yet it is well said (*Lex Rex.* pag. 372.) that they had scruples of Conscience, and doubts of the lawfulness of resisting the Emperour, being sworn to him, which may make it the more strange, that there is so little doubting now, when our engagement to Magistrates over us, is no less. True it is, *Constantine*, did make War upon *Licinius*, whom he had assumed to be an assistant in governing the Empire, for his breach of Faith and of Trust given him in that society of the Empire, and for first denouncing War against him; (the help of the distressed Christians, cruelly persecuted by him, concurring also as a motive) *Eusab. lib. 9. Hist. Eccl. cap.* 10 but that they sought help from *Constantine* the Great, against *Licinius*, is not said in the history; and although they had so done, it onely shews, hat the help of the chief Emperour may be sought against him, who was assumed as an Adjutant in the Empire, who in effect was little more then a Deputy. It is also true, that the Christians oppressed by *Barabanes* King of *Persia*, in the time of *Theodosius*, as it is, *Hist. Tripart. Lib.* 11 *cap.* 15. did flee to the *Romans* seeking their help; but then, it is also evident in the story, that remaining in the Countrey of that King, they made no insurrection against him, albeit the persecution was very cruel; they did flee and with-draw from that Kingdom, to the bounds of the *Roman* Empire: And the *Romans* refusing, upon demand of that King, to send back these who had run away, was one ground of the war, that arose between them and the *Persian*: Again, it is onely said, the Christians fleeing to the *Romans*, sought their help; which will not necessarily import, that they stirred them up, to invade their King in their behalf; but, that having come to them, they might have the help and benefit of their protection, and not be delivered up to the fury of the Tyrant, upon his demand. And further, the Persian Kings had once submitted themselves to the Roman Emperors, as their Lords; two or three of their Kings being given them, at the appointment of the Senate and Emperour of *Rome*: *Augustus*, getting both King and Kingdom, submit-

ted

ted to him in his time; and although after that time, there were many changes and revolutions in that Kingdom, the Romans did never quit their claim thereto, but keeped close to their right, and to the poſſeſſion they had of moſt of it, till *Conſtantin's* time, and even long alſo after the time of *Theodoſius*. Now, if the Chriſtians preſuming upon the Roman right to that Kingdom, as being held of the Emperor, implored this help againſt a perſecutor, whom they thought he had legal power to chaſtiſe, what makes this for private ſubjects (without concurrence of any Magiſtrate) riſing in violence againſt their own Soveraigns, who have none ſuperior to them but God?

But, not to inſiſt too much on this, we onely add, that excellent *Calvin, in the laſt chap. of the 4. book of his Inſtitutions*, hath (like a primitive Chriſtian and Divine) written ſo fully and learnedly againſt private perſons reſiſting the Magiſtrates by violence, (though they abuſe their power) that whoever will read the ſame, (as it is moſt worthy to be read throughout) will find a ſtrong confutation of all ſeditious Doctrines, ſtirring up private perſons to do violence to the Magiſtrate in any caſe; and his ſpirit, will be ſeen to be another, then theirs is, who teach ſuch things.

We come now to conſider, how far contrary to the light of ſound reaſon this poſition, giving liberty to any private perſons, (when they are able, and when they think themſelves wronged) to uſe violence upon all Magiſtrates, is: Surely, that doctrine cannot be of God, which to the eye of ſound reaſon doth remedileſly and unavoidably, (if it be admitted and reduced into practice) overthrow Gods Order, for ſettling Humane Societies, and which opens a wide gap to perpetual ſeditions, againſt all Magiſtrates; not leaving any (even the beſt of them and moſt juſtly governing) in any ſecurity from violence. For, in the way of this Libeller, every private perſon, is not only made judge of his own actings, and what he is to do, or not to do, in obedience to the Magiſtrate; but, he is made judge of his own ſufferings, he muſt ſuffer no more from the Magiſtrate, then he thinks meet, (if he can help himſelf by force.) And it is held forth as a ſin (equal at leaſt to the obeying unlawful commands) to ſuffer unjuſt puniſhments, inflicted by Powers, if men be in capacity to do violence to the Powers, or if they can conſpire and combine with others for this end. This is a Doctrine, that will pleaſe all wicked malefactors, wonderous well; and, is a fair proclamation to them, whenever they are attached, or arraigned, or condemned, or puniſhed, to beſtir themſelves to make a party, to do violence to the Magiſtrate; for, they will never want the colour of this

plea of self-defence: And, how few of them will not (if they may be their own judges) say they are innocent and deserve no punishment, or not so great? The judge saith, he is guilty, and that he must be so and so punished; make the man his own judge, he will say, the sentence is unjust, he is not bound to submit to it: And therefore, if he be in probale capacity, he will think it his duty to fall upon the Magistrate, pull the Sword out of his hand, call in to his assistance whom he may, raise violent seditions against the Magistrate; and, what may he not do for his own deliverance? Thus, under this colour, all evildoers are encouraged, to use violence against the Magistrate; and, let this Libeller consider, how he will stop the gap which he hath opened to confusion; the matter (according to his mind) being referred to each particular person, to judge of the justice of his own suffering; and his discretive judgement anent this, must determine him to resist, (as he is able) when he thinks himself wronged; shall not this be a source of continual seditions, and violent insurrections against the Magistrate, even when he proceeds most justly?

Again, how can Magistrates, in doing their duty, be secured from violence (according to this mans way) or from continual insurrections of persons pretending their innocency? It is in vain to say, Let Magistrates rule rightly and not oppress, and then Subjects will do their duty: for, albeit it be true, faithful and just Magistrates may in the way of their duty expect from God, that he will incline the hearts of their Subjects to repay duty to them; yet, in the holy permissive providence of God, it comes often to pass, that the best Princes are not best used by their Subjects, (God thus teaching good Princes to rule in his fear and righteousness, with an eye to his will, and with respect to that crown of Life, whatever hard measure they have from seditious people.) How often is it found, that Subjects are unruly and seditious even against good Magistrates? Some crossing of the will of a froward and furious party, may move them to fancy their Prince a Tyrant, and as one that is an injurious and intolerable Oppressour: whereupon they account themselves free to offer violence to him, (under the cloak of self-defence) and goes on from resistance to revenge, if they can have the upper-hand over him, and will not cease (the fury of evil consciences instigating them) till they ruine the Prince whom they have greatly provoked, in order to self-preservation from what they fear from him; and they will be ready even to mock Justice in destroying him for saving of themselves (as they call it) but the end is, the destruction of their souls and bodies for such wickedness. Let

Histories

Hiſtories be looked into, it will be found, that hardly did ever people reſiſt a Prince with violence, but in end the matter came to revenge, (if they had power) neither could they reſt but in his ruine. And alſo it will be found, that oft-times the beſt Princes have been worſt uſed, or at leaſt as evil as the naughtieſt Princes. Look to the Roman Emperors while they were Pagans, how many amongſt them who were good, (as Heathens might be) came under the ſame, or worſe fate, by the unjuſt violence of their Subjects, with theſe who were the worſt Princes? Look to Chriſtian Emperors and Kings, how many of them who were truly good, were oppreſſed and deſtroyed by their Subjects; ſometimes inflammed with ſuperſtition (which they called Religion) and ſuperſtitious reſpect to the Roman See, (the Sentences whereof were accounted as Oracles in theſe dark times) and ſometimes wrought upon by ſeditious Ring-leaders, buzzing into their ears great abuſes done to them in the matter of their Liberties? Yea, amongſt our own Kings, ſome of the beſt have been as evil uſed by prevailing parties amongſt the people, as ſome of the worſt. When once that gap is opened, and people taught, that any party of them (ſtrong enough) may get up againſt the King and all Magiſtrates, when they judge them to deal wrongouſly and injuriouſly with them, the reverence of Soveraignty is loſt, the evil wit of a ſeditious Party can ſoon paint the beſt King, as a black and ugly Tyrant, and under that form, waken up others to conſpire to his deſtruction; which ſhould make all the fearers of God, rather to endure ſome acts of real Tyranny, then by their Doctrines or Practices of reſiſtance, open a door to the deſtruction of good Kings, (by a party not of their ſpirit, but lurking under their pretences) and to the continual diſſolution, concuſſion and deſolation of humane Societies. It is good for us to hold cloſe to that neceſſary diſtinction which all ſound Divines have held, of obedience or ſubjection active and ſubjection paſſive, where the former cannot be given for fear of ſinning againſt God, (the Magiſtrat's ſuperior, and who ſhould be obeyed rather than any man in the world) the latter, (if we ſtay within his Dominions, and with-draw not from under his Soveraignty, putting our ſelves under the protection of another ſoveraign Power) is neceſſary. And ſo the Apology, p. 376, 377. acknowledged this to be neceſſary when active obedience could not be given: but *Naphtali*, Pag. 28. repents of this moderation, and contradicts the Apology, calling this ſubmiſſion brutal (though it be upon rational grounds, and the fierce violence againſt Magiſtrates is rather brutal) averring, *That none pleads for this ſubmiſſion, who have not proſtituted their conſcience to abſolute obedience*

to Princes arbitrements; and avowing, *that illimited obedience is more rational, then illimited subjection*; *and that they are but flatterers that have renounced conscience, who plead against obedience in all things to the Powers, and yet will plead for passive submission.* In this Category must all they stand, who have owned the sound Doctrine of this Distinction, and these are the soundest Divines that ever we had in the Church of God; yea, the Apologist himself (if he be worthy to be named with these) escapes not this blow. Good God! To what times are we reserved, to see so certain truths, that may be reckoned among the immovables of Religion, and the ancient Land-marks removed by an up-start furious Crue, who by their new Principles (as false as new) seek to confound both Church and State? The lawfulness of private mens counter-acting, and violent resistance to a whole Church and a whole State, is a main Article of their new Faith; and to do so, is one of their new Commandments, added to God's.

But the Libeller is all alongs much in pressing violent resistance to all powers, from the highest to the lowest, and of the whole body of the people by any party thereof (though the far minor and lesser part) in the cause of Religion, (his Religion, in the hypothesis debated in the times, is the external form of Church-government, about which, he sayes, *all the zeal of the godly should be concentred*, a low zeal, God knoweth, that hath no higher objects.) And laying down grounds (some true, some false) concerning Religion, he labours to animate any party that think themselves able to violent all Magistrates, and the body of the people about this, and to strengthen themselves by combinations, threatning Gods judgements against them who do not combine for violent resistance of all above them, (which he calls *Self-defence*) and abusing some Scriptures to that purpose.

As for Religion, that it is the chief interest that Men and Christians should look after, shall not be doubted; and where it becomes a legal right, and the Magistrate who bears the Sword leads the way, no doubt private persons may follow in the violent defence of it, against all opposing the Magistrate, the Law and themselves in owning it. Neither can it enter into a Christian heart, that it is to be surrendred unto the arbitrement or pleasure of any power in the world, nor of any Magistrate over us, as this man wickedly suggests is done. All the question is (in relation to these Times) anent private mens falling upon the Magistrates over them by violence and force of armes, when they are (by Laws agreed to by the Community) urging an outward attendance on the means and ordinances of Religion; where people needs

not

not fear to be defiled with hereſie or idolatry, or falſe worſhip, or any thing contrary to Chriſts Ordinance; whatever may be ſaid concerning private mens reſiſting the powers that urge them to idolatry or falſe worſhip, or invading their lives if they will not ſo do, comes not home to the preſent caſe. Yet, *Lactantius* word, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 20. is to be well remembred by all private perſons; *Defendenda eſt Religio à privatis omnibus non occidendo ſed moriendo*, &c. But, we ſhall come off from this matter with a few notes; 1. That the Libeller ſeems to diſallow all violenting of men in the matter of Religion; *To be violented in Religion, is the moſt wicked and inſupportable of all injuries,* (ſaith he) Page 15. It is true, to uſe violence upon any in their perſons or goods, to bring them to an external falſe Religion or Worſhip, or to drive them from the true, (otherwiſe Religion cannot be violented) is the greateſt of injuries.

But, ſhould not ſuch a word be guarded well, leaſt all co-active power of the Magiſtrate in matters of Religion, might ſeem to be diſowned, and a fair plea put in their mouths, who are for abſolute toleration? It will not ſuffice to ſay, that it is only violences done to perſons, to avert them from true Religion, and bring them to a falſe, that are counted injurious and condemned; for, albeit upon the matter it is certain, there is difference between true and falſe Religion; yet, what Sectary is there in the World, but will pretend he is violented by the Magiſtrate for true Religion, when he is put to trouble for his way; for, every one of them thinks, and will avow, that in his Conſcience his way is right, and according to the Word of God; (be it ſo or not) and therefore, if he be put to trouble for his way, will account himſelf violented in the matter of Religion, and highly injured; it is this mans principle, that every man in his diſcretive judgement, is judge of the juſtice or injuſtice of his own ſufferings, and accordingly, muſt determine anent his reſiſtance to the violence. If every errant be admitted judge of the juſtice of his own ſuffering, accounting his own Religion beſt; he cannot but think, the violenting him in it, is a ſufficient injury, to engage him in violent reſiſtance to the Magiſtrate. And then, what a world of ſedition and confuſion ſhall we have, or elſe the Magiſtrate muſt ſurceaſe the uſe of his co-active power in theſe matters? Again, does not this man, plainly profeſs to ſtir up all, with whom he can prevail, to violent others, (Magiſtrates, Church-men, People and all) in the matter of their profeſſion? For even private men are ſtirred by bloody exhortations, to be revenged on and puniſh all Magiſtrates and others, whoſe

blood

blood they thirſt for; becauſe of their not being of their way, which they call Religion: Nor avails it them to ſay, their way is the true Religion, the way of others in points of Church-government, it is falſe; and therefore, though they being private men, may violent and puniſh others, even Magiſtrates and all Rulers; yet, other Magiſtrates or any other, may not violent them. But, whether truth lies on their ſide or not, is the queſtion; and, if they will not admit publick Powers and Authorities to be Judges in that matter; far leſſe have theſe reaſon, to admit of private perſons to be their Judges: But ſo ſelfie are ſuch men, that they think they have a right to violent all men, in that they call Religion, to force them to it; but, that no man hath right to violent them in their way: Shall their private judgement capacitate them ſufficiently, if they have Power to violent others; and yet, no publick Power can violent them, or turn them off, from their perſwaded way; which, upon tryal, will not be found the ſafe way? 2. The Libeller appears all along, very cautious of the probable capacity that private perſons muſt have, before they attempt reſiſtance to powers; *And thinks, that this, together with the intolerable injury in matter of Religion or Liberty, gives* (without need of further) *ſufficient call*; *and that ſuch as are injured, and in capacity probable to through their work, ſin, if they obey not that calling to riſe*; *and nothing can excuſe from not riſing, but want of this capacity.* This brings to mind Cardinal *Bellarmin's* excuſe he hath, why the ancient Chriſtians took not Arms againſt *Nero*, *Julian*, *Valens*, *&c.* becauſe they wanted temporal ſtrength, (wherein he is ſoundly refuted by our Divines) and brings to mind alſo what *Creſwel* the *Jeſuite*, hath againſt the Edict of the Queen of *England Elizabeth*, that Subjects having ſufficient power, not onely lawfully may, but ought, by vertue of divine Precept, and as they would avoid the damnation, or extream peril of their ſouls, to depoſe and throw down heretical Kings: This Libeller fully conſents, with the Jeſuites, not only as to the matter of violent reſiſtance to Princes; but even as to the depoſing and throwing down of them, and all Magiſtrates, and puniſhing them, by private hands; and is more injurious to Princes, then they are, as ſhall be cleared in the following Chapter. But, in this matter, he hath borrowed the caution from the Jeſuites; that, any private perſons (*ſi modo vires ad id idoneas habeant*, as the *Jeſuites* ſpeak) are bound to reſiſt Powers, and to be revenged on them, and puniſh them. 3. The Libeller, would bind the neceſſity of combinations, (as he calls them) or conſpiracies againſt Princes,

and

and ſeditious inſurrections (*Naphtali*, Page 17.) upon all private perſons, not only upon the grounds of humanity, but upon the ground of religious love and fraternal affection; whereby we are bound to relieve the diſtreſſed, eſpecially for Religion, and upon the ground of Religious reſpect to the concernments of Gods glory, to which the intereſts of all Powers and Common-wealths muſt cede. As to this latter of Gods glory, and its concernments; there is no doubt, that is above all humane intereſts, and they ought to cede to the ſame. All the queſtion is, whether ſuch violent courſes againſt Magiſtrates, (though miſcarrying in ſome part of their duty) be for Gods glory? God is not glorified by mens ſins, but when his own Will is done; it is an ordinary thing, that men in their deep deceitfulneſs, pretend God's glory, when they are diſhonouring him, by diſobeying his Will, *Iſ. 66. 5. Your Brethren that caſt you out, for my Names ſake, ſaid, let God be glorified*, &c. But for the former, anent Chriſtian love, and the obligation thereof, to relieve the diſtreſſed, that is ſurely a duty to love, and relieve the diſtreſſed Brethren; but that love, in the external acts of it, muſt be regulated by ſound reaſon, and by the Word of God: Chriſtian charity binds me, not to relieve and aſſiſt a diſtreſſed brother, in every manner of aſſiſtance; but in that which is within the bounds of my calling, and that which is agreeable to juſtice. A man is not bound to forſake his own ſtation, or run beyond the limits of his calling, to relieve a diſtreſſed brother; No man is bound to ſteal, that he may give almes; or to defraud others of what he is indebted to them, to exerciſe his charity to the indigent.

And doth not this man himſelf confeſſe, that prudence ſhould meaſure and regulate the exerciſe of love, in aſſiſting a diſtreſſed brother, and that no man ſhould put his own life in certain peril of loſing, in ſaving the life of another; nor attempt for that end to uſe force, where there is no probable capacity to carry the matter through. If brethren be diſtreſſed by the Magiſtrate, (ſuppoſe unjuſtly) we are bound to aſſiſt them in love, by our Prayers to God for them, by conſolatory words, if we may have acceſſe to them, by giving counſel to them, ſupplying their need as far as we may; yea, by intreaties and humble petitions to the Magiſtrate, (as we have opportunity) with all dutiful reſpects to them: But, if nothing can avail for their relief, private perſons have diſcharged their duty, in the point of the exerciſe of Chriſtian love, and are not obliged, to offer violence to the Publick Magiſtrate, or violently to reſiſt him, in aſſiſting others;

but, in the case of their brethrens unjust suffering, commit the matter to him who judgeth righteously, possessing their Souls in patience, as they ought also to do, in the case of their own wrongful suffering. But, it opens a gap to all confusion, to allow private persons (if they think they have power enough) to use violence upon the Magistrate, for relieving their brethren, whom they think oppressed: Such pretences, will not be wanting to the worst of men; and the best Magistrate, proceeding most Legally, shall never have security from seditious parties, (unless they have visible power to crush them) but they shall be resisted, when any party thinks meet; and from resistance, there shall be a proceeding to revenge, (if might and power be sufficient) as seldome, or never is it seen, that resistance of the Magistrate and revenge upon him, (when a party can have the upper-hand) are separated in exercise and practice, (whatever be mens notions of the separableness of the same) And the Principles of this man lead to both, as hath appeared, and will yet more. 4. The Libeller holds out from Scripture, one ground which he thinks should engage all to combine to relieve him and his party, when they count themselves oppressed, and that is, *Because of the ommission of this duty of relieving the oppressed, or violation of it; whole Kingdoms and Cities have been involved in the guilt of the oppression, committed by one or few, and fearful judgements have therefore overtaken them, to their utter ruine and subversion.* And, pag. 18. he asserts, *That for simple connivance and tolerance, (without active compliance with transgressors) God avengeth the sins of Rulers onely, or People onely, or of any part of the People onely, upon the whole body of Rulers and People*; and he cites, Jer. 25. 15. Deut. 13. 12. 13, 14, 15. Josh. 22. 17, 18, 19. and *Achans* case, *Josh.* 7. building also his tenet upon the Covenants expresse or implicit, betwixt God and the whole People, Rulers and Subjects, *&c.* And, so is confident, that if the violation of duty, in not relieving the oppressed, (especially for Religion) involve all failers in it, in sin and destruction; all and every private person, is obliged to this duty, to relieve and recover, by violence, oppressed ones out of the hand of the Magistrate; as they would keep themselves pure from sin, and hold off Wrath from themselves, and from the place they live in.

Naph. pag. 17, 18, 19.

Hence a question considerable comes to be resolved, whether God imputes the sin of one man to another, whereunto he is no way accessory; but that he tolerates what he cannot amend by any means,

means, within the bounds of his calling? or, whether he executes judgement upon any for the sins of others, which they are not accessory to, and cannot amend, abiding in the bounds of their calling? And particularly, whether God imputes the sins of Rulers to People, and punishes them for the same? or, imputes the sins of any part of a People, to the whole, or of the major part, to the lesser, and punishes them therefore, when they cannot (abiding within the bounds of their calling) amend the same, but are no otherwise accessory? Not to dip into that question, in the full latitude of it, we do onely now enquire, if in Divine justice, a Prince is any time punished for the sins of the People, (at which he doth not connive, and whereto he is not accessory in any degree) or, if a body of a People be punished for one mans sin, whereunto they are not accessory; or, if private persons be punished for the sins of Rulers, or of the body of the People, whereunto they are not accessory; but only with grief tolerates what they cannot amend, abiding within the bounds of their calling; this last, is the point we must fix upon: And herein against this Author, it is asserted; that, first, no man is involved in Divine judgements and punishments for the sins of others, (as the deserving cause of his punishment) if he be no way accessory to these sins of others. 2. That no private subject is accessory to the sins of Rulers, nor involved in the punishments of the same, meerly upon the account of his tolerating the sins, or not violent resisting the Magistrate in his sinful courses. A certain thing it is, that (setting aside the satisfactory suffering of Christ, when he put himself under the stroke of Divine justice for the sins of others, having no sin of his own) God doth not properly punish any man, but in reference to his own personal sin, (as the deserving cause of the punishment) albeit he may, and often doth take occasion, in his Wise Providence, to punish men for their own sins, from the sins of others, (and in that only sense, they may be said to be punished for the sins of others) But every Soul suffers for his own sin, Divine justice finding deserving causes of punishment in every one that is punished, either their personal accession to the sins of others, (which is their own sin) or else some other sins; for which, he may in justice inflict the punishment upon them, albeit the impulsive cause or occasion rather for punishing in such a manner or time, &c. be from the sins of others. Every man shall bear his own burthen: As no man goes to hell, for the sin of another, without his own deserving; so, no man is afflicted by God on earth, but must say, there are

deſerving cauſes of that in himſelf; howbeit, the Lord may have other and higher deſigns in the affliction, then puniſhment of ſin.

It is alſo no leſs certain to us, that if the Magiſtrate do not connive at ſins of Subjects, nor neglect to curb and puniſh them, the ſins of the people ſhall no way be imputed to him (he not being thereunto acceſſory in any way) nor ſhall he be puniſhed for their ſins, which in his place and calling he is wreſtling againſt, and uſing his power againſt them. Alſo, it is alike certain, that private perſons ſhall not have the ſins of Magiſtrates, or of the body of the people, imputed to them; nor be puniſhed for the ſame, if ſo be they honeſtly indeavour to do all things againſt theſe ſins, which in their private calling they are bound to do: If they keep themſelves pure without any degree of acting theſe ſins, or any way of acceſſion to them; if they mourn and ſigh for evils that are done; if they be earneſt in prayer, that God may convert others from their evil way; if they (as they can have opportunity) faithfully admoniſh, and ſtudy to reclaim, theſe who are out of the way, and do ſuch like Chriſtian duties, God will never enter in judgement with them, for not doing violence to the Authorities that are above them, or for not wakening up confuſions in the Societies they live in, to the deſtruction of many. That God's people of old were puniſhed, upon occaſion of ſins of their Magiſtrates, *Jerem.* 15. 4. and the like places, was, becauſe they were ſharers in the guiltineſs themſelves, (not by not violent reſiſting, which they were never exhorted to) but by direct or indirect acceſſion, otherwayes, *Ephraim* (ſayes *Hoſea*, ch. 5 11.) *is oppreſſed and broken in judgement; becauſe he willingly walked after the commandment.* And, *Jerem.* 5. 31. when the corruption of Rulers is ſpoken of, it is added, *My people love to have it ſo.* It was not the ſin of the Rulers that involved the people in guiltineſs, or rendred them obnoxious unto judgement, but their own acceſſions to the Rulers ſin by conſent or otherwiſe. Let Mr. *Calvin* be read upon *Jer.* 15. 4. he ſpeaks moſt judiciouſly, diſcourſing of the ſins of *Manaſſeh* that brought on judgement: *Non ſolus Rex fuit author hujus ſævitiæ, ſed conſenſu populi veri Dei cultores tracti fuerunt ad necem: hinc patet fuiſſe commune totius populi ſcelus; ſponte aſſenſi ſunt Regi.* And there he ſhows, they continued in the ſame ſins that broke forth in *Manaſſeh* his time, and they were puniſhed for their own ſins, albeit occaſion is taken to remember that dreadful time of *Manaſſeh*, when the wickedneſs began that was after continued in with obſtinacy. And that ſame excellent Divine, writing on the ſecond and third Verſe of *Jerem.* 22. (a place abuſed by *Lex Rex* and others,

others, to ſtir up the people to take the ſword in their hand to relieve the oppreſſed, and execute judgement againſt Magiſtrates) ſpeaks moſt judiciouſly; *Hoc maxime ad Regem & Judices ac præfectos ſpectat, nam ſcimus privatos homines non eſſe armatos ad defenſionem bonorum.* And upon the end of the third Verſe, *Hæc proprie ad Judices ſpectant, ejus doctrina non niſi ad Regem & Judices publicos dirigitur, neque enim pertinet ad vulgus ipſum aut privatos homines.* And he adds, that the reaſon why that word, *execute judgement*, &c. is uttered in the hearing of the people, is not that the executing thereof belonged to them, but that, when they heard the houſe of *David*, which was *Sacroſancta*, cited before Gods Tribunal, and threatned for omiſſion of theſe things, (the Kings being *quodammodo Legibus ſoluti*, as he ſpeaks) people might be moved to examine their own lives, and to repent of their private injuſtices in their places. And it is to be noted, that the prophetical preachings (reproving the not relieving the oppreſſed, and not executing judgement, and exhorting to theſe duties omitted) uttered to the body of Rulers and People, are to be underſtood as reproving what was amiſs in every one in their reſpective callings, and as injoining ſuch duties as might be done by every one: *Salva juſtitia, ſalvo ordine & pro modulo vocationis*; people are warned againſt private oppreſſions, Rulers againſt publick, and every one in their ſtation exhorted to deal righteouſly. But to ſay, that whenever the Prophets, in their Sermons, reproved poſitive oppreſſion, or commanded executing of righteouſneſs, they minded to condemn in the people, the grand ſin of non-reſiſtance to the oppreſſing Magiſtrate, or to cry out againſt it, or to incite private perſons or people to pull the Sword out of the Magiſtrates hand, and relieve the oppreſſed, and execute judgement on the oppreſſors, even Magiſtrates, (as *Lex Rex* doth ſay, *P.* 367.) is not only a moſt fearful perverting of the holy Scripture, to make it a cloak wherewith to cover ſeditious Practices, but a Doctrine that tends directly to horrid confuſion and utter ſubverſion of humane Societies. And verily, let this Principle be once admitted, that the ſins of Rulers and Governors involves the people in ſin, and makes them obnoxious to judgement (albeit they be not acceſſory thereunto, directly nor indirectly, only they tolerate what they cannot amend, abiding within the bounds of their calling.) Neither can the conſciences of people, nor the State of the Common-wealth, have any true peace or quietneſs: For, 1. once grant this, then what a continual puzzle ſhould tender-hearted Chriſtians be in, anent the actions of their Rulers and Magiſtrates, and they behoved to meddle with,

and

and examine all their proceedings, leſt they ſhould involve them in ſin and judgement, (and to do ſo, were indeed work enough, and above, to private Chriſtians) and they might be put into this fear to be guilty, or involved in judgement for matters of Government, not probably or morally poſſible for them to know: What a ground of great diſquietneſs ſhould this be? 2. Would not this be a perpetual Seminary of unavoidable ſedition in the Common-wealth, and of expoſing the Magiſtrate to violence, no leſs when he is acting juſtly, then when unjuſtly? Such is the ignorance and corruption of moſt of people, who will never want this ready pretence, If we ſuffer the Magiſtrates to do ſuch a thing, and not oppoſe them by force, we ſhall with them be involved in ſin and judgement. But, as to the Scriptures he abuſes, to prove that people are involved in guiltineſs, or made obnoxious to the judgements of God, by the ſins of their Rulers, (albeit they have no acceſſion thereunto, but only not violent reſiſting them) and that one part of people may be ſo involved in ſin and wrath, by the ſins of another part: and that therefore they ought to uſe violent reſiſtance againſt the ſinning Rulers or People: The firſt place is, *Jer.* 26. 15. where the Prophet *Jeremiah*, 8. *ver.* is apprehended by the Prieſts, the Prophets and all the people, for his faithful preaching, 9. *ver. All the people were gathered together in the houſe of the Lord againſt him, and ſaid, thou ſhalt ſurely die*: whereupon the Princes come and ſit in the entry of the new gate of the Lords houſe, and the Prieſts accuſe him before them, *ver.* 10, 11. The Prophet *Jeremiah* delivered his meſſage to them all, avows his commiſſion to the Princes and to all the people, cloſing his ſpeech ſubmiſſively, 14, 15. *Behold, I am in your hand, do unto me as ſeemeth good and meet unto you. But, know ye for certain, if ye put me to death, ye ſhall ſurely bring innocent blood upon your ſelves, and upon this City, and upon the inhabitants thereof.* Where two things are to be marked; 1. That *Jeremiah* is ſpeaking to the Princes and all the people, or the great confluence of the body of the people at that time, warning them not to meddle with his blood, the Princes that they ſhould not unjuſtly condemn him, the people that they ſhould not conſent to, nor co-operate with, an unjuſt ſentence, as to the execution thereof, (as the manner of execution was amongſt that people, ſtoning, *&c.*) And, 2. he certifies both, that if they conſented and co-operated to his death, they ſhould bring innocent blood upon themſelves, and upon the city and inhabitants thereof. He doth not at all incite the people to riſe up and reſcue him by violence out of the hands of Rulers, if they ſhould give ſentence of death againſt

against him, (neither did ever any of the holy Prophets instigate people to use violent resistance against their perverse Magistrates, nor did they ever reprove, directly or indirectly, that sin of non-violent resistance to Magistrates, as some excessively bold do averr) But only warns Princes and people both, that they be not by consent or concurrence accessory to his death, lest it should bring vengeance upon them all, because of their consent and concurrence; a deep accession to the same. It will perhaps be said, that the Prophet not only intimates, that they who heard him, Princes and people, should be guilty of his innocent blood, and obnoxious to judgement; but even the rest of the people, who (although the confluence then was great) could not be all present; yea, Children and Infants, and all the dwellers in the City, and the City it self, should be involved in the sin and wrath following it.

I answer, that none could be defiled with the sin, but such as one way, or another, made themselves guilty by accession to it; either in action, or in omission of that, which they were in their calling and station, capacitated to do for hindering it; (such as violent resistance of Magistrates, by private persons, was not) neither doth the Prophet mean, that all the absents, all the infants, of that great City, (who knew nothing of the matter) should be guilty of the shedding his innocent blood, (if it were shed) or should properly upon that account, deserve the wrath of God; onely he means, that the consentors, actors, and such as were omitting their duty, publick or private, in reference to the preventing of that sin, should be involved in the guiltiness of it, and incur the wrath of God for it: But as for other Inhabitants of the City, absents, Children, *&c.* though for that sin, (they not knowing of it) they could not be judged properly guilty of it, or deserving wrath for it; yet, he intimates, that the Lord by occasion of it, (should it be committed) would bring wrath even upon these, (although for other sins, as the meritorious cause upon their part) And the judgement and wrath, that for the sin of shedding innocent blood, should come upon all the people and inhabitants of that City, might be indeed properly a punishment to the Rulers, for that particular sin, and to the people accessory thereto in any way; but could not be a punishment, (for that sin particularly) upon them who were no way accessory to it, but onely a punishment for their own demerits; albeit the execution, *hic & nunc* occasioned by the sin of others. This is a sure truth, that God may justly punish the Princes or Fathers, in the punishment of subjects or children, *Castigantur parentes in filiis, tanquam in sua carne charissima,*

riſſima, *Zanch.* 4. *pr.* (they being as it were, parts of themſelves) may, (I ſay) puniſh them, with temporal judgements at leaſt; this is agreeable ro his juſtice, who viſits the ſins of the fathers upon the children, 2^d *Command*: But yet, when he is puniſhing Princes or Parents, in their children or ſubjects, there is alſo in theſe who are puniſhed an internal demeriting cauſe of the ſtrokes laid on, that they ſhall have no reaſon to quarrel with God, or to ſay, *The Fathers have eaten ſowre Grapes, and the Childrens teeth are ſet on edge*, *Ezek.* 18. 2. Sometimes perſons may be puniſhed in the affliction or puniſhment that falls on other perſons neer to them, but yet the affliction of theſe other perſons, is alwayes deſerved by their own ſins; albeit, God in his wiſe providence, makes theſe very ſame afflictions to be puniſhments alſo of the ſins of others, to whom they they are neerly related. But as to this place, it is not the Prophets mind to intimate, (as this man ſaith) that for violation of this duty, of not offering violence to the Magiſtrate, proceeding unjuſtly, wrath ſhould come on them all of that City, there is not the leaſt evidence of any ſuch intention he had, to ſtir up the people to do ſuch a thing; only, he gives faithful warning to all ranks, not to conſent or cooperate to ſuch a wickedneſs, which might bring wrath upon them, as *Diodat* hath it; *ye will make your ſelves guilty before God of this fact, and burthen your ſelves with it.*

Naphtali p. 19. Then for that place, *Deut.* 13. 12, 13, 14, 15. *If thou ſhalt hear, &c.* he aſſerts, that it makes much for his poſition of the lawfulneſs of peoples *riſing againſt all Magiſtrates, ſupreme and ſubordinate, or of any part of the people, their riſing againſt the greater part, wickedly back-ſlidden.* And he is bold to ſay, that aſtricting this place or the like, to the Hypotheſis contained in the letter of the word, *&c.* is to elude Scripture, and to mock the Holy Ghoſt, by whom it is given. To which, 1. certainly this Libeller ſpeaks like a Divine, calling a conſcientious cleaving to the literal meaning of the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture, an eluding all Scripture, or mocking the Holy Ghoſt, by whom it was given; are not they rather deluders of the Scripture, and of the Spirit of God, who labour to make a noſe of wax of the Holy Scriptures, wringing and wreſting them where they will, introducing their own fancies upon the Word, and not embracing the clear ſenſe of the Spirit of God, directly held forth in the Word? In this art of wyre-drawing the Scripture-words, without any warrand or good reaſon; and of covering crooked courſes with Gods cloak, (as is ſaid of theſe, *Mal.* 2. 16.

who

Who cover violence With his garment) this man and his complices (men of blood and violence) are ſingularly experienced. 2. This is a ſure rule, That no expoſition of a Text can ſubſiſt, that is either contrary to other Texts of Scripture, or to ſound reaſon: but ſo it is, that the expoſition given by this man of this Text, as if it favoured his poſition for meer private perſons, or any part of a people taking not only the defenſive Sword in hand, but the vindicative and puniſhing Sword againſt all Magiſtrates, higher and lower, and againſt the body of the Society, whereof they are Members, and the leſſer part alſo, is contrary both to plain Scripture and to reaſon. The Scripture commits the vindicative and puniſhing Sword only to the Magiſtrate, *Rom.* 13. He only is Gods Sword-bearer that way. And amongſt Magiſtrates there is a ſupreme power, 1 *Pet.* 2. on whom all others have dependence, as to their call and the exerciſe thereof. And it is a Doctrine point-blank contrary to reaſon, remedileſly tending to diſſolve humane Societies, and all Kingdoms and Common-wealths, and opening a door to all ſeditious confuſions; to teach, that any meer private perſons, or any part of a people (who think themſelves ſtrong enough) ſhould take on them to ſit and act as puniſhing Judges over all Magiſtrates, ſupreme and ſubordinate, conſtituted by the body of a people; yea, and upon the major part of the people themſelves. Oh, horrid confuſion, to be deteſted by all rational and Chriſtian hearts! that the minor meer private part of a people, ſhould ſet themſelves down as Judges upon the whole body of a people, and the generality of the Magiſtrates: and upon their own fanſies, led with their own luſts, draw the magiſtratical Sword, which God never committed to them, and ſtrike both the Magiſtrates of all ſorts and degrees, and their neighbours therewith. This ſure is not the work of God, (however it be faced or varniſhed) but of Sathan. 3. The man fanſies an adverſary to himſelf, while he brings-in ſome, ſaying, *That in the caſe of equal diviſion of Cities, faithful and unfaithful, matters ſhould come to accommodation anent ſerving or not ſerving other gods*, (the caſe, *Deut.* 13.) *or that if the major part went wrong, the minor ſhould reſt in a ſinful acquieſcence, and be thereto obliged by the major part.* Who ever ſaid ſo? or, (if there be any ſpark of Gods fear in the heart) will ſay ſo? There is no coming to accommodation in ſuch matters, whither the true God, or other gods, ſhould be ſerved and followed, (and yet this man would be very ſevere, if no Nation in the world might (having before been embodied in a Kingdom or State) continue and abide in their peaceable communion in civil intereſts, upon ſuppo-

sition of such an equal division arising amongst them.) As for the obligation that the major part of a people might put upon the minor, to a sinful acquiescence, who will allow that? There should be no sinful acquiescence, nor any acquiescence at all to any party, were they never so many, who run away from God after other gods or idols. But (supposing a Government democratick) though the lesser part is not to acquiesce in the way of the greater, running into rebellion against God; but by all means competent to them, bear witness against that way, and study to keep themselves pure, when they cannot prevail to have matters rectified, as to the whole body: yet, cannot people keep their conscience and practice undefiled, unless they overthrow by violence (which is the thing all alongs aimed at by this man) Gods order in the Societies whereof they are members, and instate themselves in the power God hath not given them? 4. This Libeller is a very confident person, pronouncing Oracles *ex scrinio pectoris*, while he affirmeth, that the constitution of Civil Government amongst Gods people, to which the Texts, *Deut.* 13. *Judg* 22. *&c.* do relate, was democratick. Upon the contrary we affirm, that from *Moses* time (who is called King in *Jesurun*, *Deut.* 33. 5.) the Lord never appointed, nor allowed, a democratical Government amongst his people, (although the principles of this man and his consorts do lead to the worst sort of Democracy, as the only lawful Government; yea, to an Oligarchick Democracy (if so we may speak) wherein the lesser part of meer private persons may tread down the greater, and all Magistrates also from the highest to the lowest, if they can have strength enough.) The Government of that people until *Sauls* time, was properly Theocratical, *The Lord was their King*, 1 Sam. 12. 12. in another way and more special, then he is King over all the earth: From him they had their judicial Laws particularly set down to them; He appointed in his Word their high Senate or Sanhedrim, (wherein the high Priest was a chief Member, and other Priests Members also, not eligible by the people, as neither were the heads of the Tribes of *Israel*) to rule them under himself; He did now and then send out his extraordinary Vice-royes (the Judges) till *Samuels* time, who not only were Saviours to deliver them from their enemies, but Judges to rule them in times of peace, for many years together: and when these were not sent, they had their setled Sanhedrim or Senate of Gods appointment, to govern them. Again, that command, *Deut.* 13. did reach all times of that *Israelitish* estate, even when they came to be under Kings and visible Monarchs, who unquestionably had the supreme power of the Sword: nor was it free for private persons,

upon

upon any pretence, to take hold of it, for revenging or punishing without them, (as this man would have private persons now to do.) And further, though the word, *Deut.* 13. 12. be spoken to the people, *If thou shalt hear say*, &c. yet, it is alwayes to be understood, that the peoples concurrence in the punishing of an apostate City, was to be within the bounds of their calling, and under the conduct of the Magistratical power set over them. As when inticers to idolatry are in the former part of the Chapter injoined to be taken order with (however nearly they were related to people) and to be stoned; it is not to be supposed, that the charge is given to every private person *brevi manu* to do this, but judgement was to be execute on them after judicial conviction and sentence given by the Magistrate, as *Drodat* notes well, *ver.* 8. *Procure* (saith he) *vengeance on him, in way of justice accusing him to the Magistrate by information or sufficient proof.* So also, in the case of apostasie of a City, a judicial process is required, 14. *ver. Thou shalt enquire and make search, and ask diligently and behold if it be truth, and the thing certain*, &c. *Pelargus* notes on the place, *Ne indicta causa quispiam temere à nimium fervidis condemnetur, actio à Magistratu est instituenda post famam publicam, defensio reo est concedenda.* But this man will have meer private persons, without any judicial proceeding by the Magistrate, to execute vengeance against all apostate Magistrates, and Ministers, and People. This he furiously instigates people to do, and by him and his party, all are held Apostates who differ in a point of external Church-government from them, albeit they hold fast the true Protestant Religion (according to Gods Word and our good Laws) in the integrity of their souls.

The other place abused by him, is *Josh.* 22. 17, 18, 19. (*Naph* p. 19) which he thinks gives warrand for private persons to use the revenging Sword upon Apostates, for turning away Gods wrath. But, how absurdly abuseth he the holy Scripture? It is most clear, they were no private persons that transacted that business with the children of *Reuben*, *Gad* and *Manasseh*, nor the minor part of that people of God. The Congregation of the Judges and Princes of the people, conveened under the conduct of *Joshua*, their Judge then living. *Phineas*, the high Priests son, with the rest of the Princes of the Tribes, are sent to treat with the Reubenites, anent the altar they had set up, and they return a satisfying answer. Now, let any judge what makes all this for the encroachment of meer private persons upon the use of the Magistrates avenging Sword on Apostates. Besides the body of the peoples

concurring, we have the Magistrates, supreme and subordinate, acting their parts in their station, who, had they not used their Authority (had that supposed defection been indeed real) had been truly guilty of sinful connivance.

As to the third place cited, *Judg.* 19. in the case of *Israel* and *Benjamin*, that time was indeed the time thrice spoken of, *Judges*, 17. 6. 18. 1. 21. 25. *When there was no King in Israel, every man did what is right in his own eyes*; (if this be aimed at by this man, his heart and wayes can tell.) It is hard to show what the Government about that time was. *Martyr*, on 18. of the *Judges*, tells us, the People of God in these times were under the power of the *Philistines*, *Collapsa erant omnia* (saith he) *quod Rege ac Magistratu Respublica destituerentur*. Yet shall we not think it likely, but they retained somewhat of their Sanhedrim appointed, *Deut.* 17. which in such a horrid case might draw together in an extraordinary meetings but let it be so, that the Government was democratick then (which cannot be proven) yet seing it is the body or major part of the People that uses the Sword against the lesser, it makes nothing for this Libeller, who will have the minor part to use the Sword, to punish Magistrates of all degrees, and the major part of the people also (if they have strength enough.)

As to *Achans* case, *Jos.* 7. There is nothing in it to justifie private persons rising against the Magistrates, and plurality of the people to avert the judgements of God, nor for using violence upon them, in case of their sinning against God, (which is the Libellers position) what was done to *Achan* was done by the Supreme Magistrate *Joshuah*, and not by meer private persons usurping his power. *Achans* sin being so secret and unknown, could not involve the whole multitude into sin, and render them obnoxious to divine wrath (they not knowing it, far less being accessory to it.) And albeit it be said, *Israel hath sinned*, 11. *v.* yet as *Diodate* and others say well, the meaning is, one of *Israel hath sinned*, not the whole collective body: and although by occasion of that sin of one member of the body, other members are smitten; yet in the justice of God, these smitten members had their own guiltiness drawing on strokes upon them, the out-letting whereof was in divine wisdom ordered upon occasion of *Achans* sin. These two things we are peremptory in. 1. That God in his holy justice doth not punish any part of a people for the sins of another part, to which they are no wayes accessory, only they tollerate what they cannot amend, keeping within compasse of their calling, albeit in his holy Providence and Wisdom, he may, and doth often, take occasion of punishing one part of a People for their own

own ſins, from the ſinning of another part of that ſame Body and Corporation. Every man that is puniſhed, hath in himſelf the meritorious cauſe of the puniſhment; albeit the riſe of the execution of the puniſhment *hic & nunc* be occaſion'd by the ſins of neighbours, or members of that ſame body. 2. In this we are peremptory, that whatever opportunities, the Lord in his holy Wiſdom doth take of puniſhing one part of a people, upon the breaking out of the ſins of another part of a people, yet private perſons have no warrand thereupon to uſurp the Magiſtrates Sword, nor to uſe it againſt himſelf, if he be the offender, or againſt other offenders; and the pretence of turning away Gods judgements from our ſelves, will not juſtifie ſuch diſorder and intruſion beyond the lines of our Calling. This is the *το κρινομενον*, the true queſtion betwixt us, and this man with his complices; in every caſe where he apprehends defection, he will have private men, uſurping the Magiſtrates puniſhing and revenging Sword againſt all, for averting Gods wrath (albeit to violent him[illegible] his, in matter of Religion, he affirmes is the greateſt oppreſſion.) He thinks, he and his complices may force all by the Sword to their way, but muſt not be forced by any. Who can endure ſuch Turkiſh Tyrranny, ſuch Doctrines and Practices, ſo ſubverſive of humane Societies? If he (or his conſorts) can produce either Scripture, Command or allowed Example, warranding any party of meer private perſons, to take and uſe not only the defenſive Sword, but the avenging and puniſhing Sword, againſt Magiſtrates of all degrees, and againſt the Body of a people, upon pretence of Religion or any other, we ſhall kiſs his hands, and humbly yeeld to Gods truth (accounting this our greateſt victory) otherwiſe we muſt ſay, he is a very wordie *Thraſo* to tell us, that any thing he ſayes (perverting the ſenſe of Scripture) may ſtop the mouth of all contradiction; and we muſt look upon him as Sathans inſtrument, to introduce confuſion in the world. And though he pleads for private perſons falling upon Magiſtrates, and others of the Common-wealth for their ſins, that Gods wrath may be turned away in their puniſhment, it hath no weight with us: for, albeit the Lord may, in his holy wiſe Providence, take the riſe of the out-letting of his judgements on ſome from the ſins of others related to them, yet hath he not made his Providence the Rule of our actions to warrand us (being private Perſons) to puniſh them; but we muſt go to the Law and Teſtimony to ſeek the Rules of our actions. And whatever action is not according to this, there is no light in it, it is but a work of darkneſs, for all the fair colours men can ſet upon it: albeit God viſit the ſins of Parents upon Children; yet that gives no warrand to Children to offer violence to their Parents for their ſins.

But

But yet the Libeller cannot ſo leave the matter, but after many ranting and rambling words (which it were a pain to ripe up, nor is it our purpoſe, minding onely to notice his abuſes of Scripture, and impertinent reaſonings) he comes at length to his great reſerve, *pag.* 30. and ſayes, If all theſe things do not ſatisfy (as indeed they are ſoon pleaſed, who will be ſatisfied by him) he hath yet, four or five particulars that will make all ſure for his poſition, which he hath been labouring to underprop, (*viz.*) That any private perſons, may againſt all Magiſtrates, and the great body of the Common-wealth, take and uſe not only the ſelf defending, but vindicative, puniſhing and reforming Sword.) And, 1. he ſaith, *That the reaſon of delivering the Kingdom to the People, and not to the King, with the Law it ſelf,* (*Deut.* 17. 14. *no way contradicted or repealed, by the manner of the Kingdom, and in effect of Tyranny fore told, by way of diſſwaſive,* 1 *Sam.* 8. 10.) *doth make much for his poſition.* But, 1. the man utters here, a groſs untruth; For, God doth not in the Text, deliver the Kingdom to the People, and not to the King, (as he ſaith) he doth only before hand, inſtruct the People anent the right way of ſetting of a King over them, (when it ſhould come to paſs, that they ſhould do ſo) and leaves in his Word, inſtructions for the King that ſhould be ſet over them, how to behave himſelf: That the Kingdom is here delivered to the People, to be managed by them, as well as to the King, or with reſerve of Power to them, to uſe violence upon and againſt the King, (if he ſhould deviate from the rules there ſet down) as this man contends, is moſt falſe: the People had not ſo much Power, as to chooſe the perſon that was to be King; God reſerved this for himſelf, 15. *ver. Thou ſhalt in any wiſe ſet him King over thee, whom the Lord thy God ſhall chooſe*, neither ever did they chooſe a King, but onely accepted of the Kings, choſen and given them by God, and deſigned to them by his extraordinary Embaſſadours; as is clear, firſt in *Saul*, and after in *David* and his Family, the choſen Royal Family. Neither were the People to look on their Kings, as their ſervants or vaſſals, or creatures, (as ſuch men uſe to write) but as ſet over them, *Thou ſhalt ſet him over thee*, (not under thee) *whom the Lord thy God ſhall chooſe*) neither had they power over the King, but the King by Gods Ordinance had power over them. 2. Were it ſo, that the Kingdom or the Power of managing it, were delivered to the People, (which is moſt falſe) yet this makes nothing to this Libellers poſition; giving Power to any party of private Perſons amongſt People, to puniſh all Magiſtrates,

and

and the major part of the people too, (if they be ſtrong enough) whatever was granted to the People here, was granted to the body; not to this, or that party of private perſons. 3. It is very true, the place, 1 *Sam.* 8. 10. (and not, 1 *Sam.* 10. 10. as he miſ-cites both this and the former Scripture) neither contradicts, nor repeales that Law, *Deut.* 17. 14. but agrees notably with it. But it is falſe, that onely the Tyranny of a King is there ſpoken of, by way of meerly diſſwaſive: *Moſes* and *Samuel* do very well agree together, the one ſhews what a King ſhould do *ex officio* and *de jure*, the other what a King may do, by the power he hath, and yet not be obnoxious to puniſhment, from Subjects; The one ſhews what a good King ſhould do, the other, what a People ſhould ſuffer of an evil King, without attempt of violence upon him: The one ſets forth Gods approbative Law, and inſtructs Kings in their kingly duties; the other ſets down the permiſſive Law of the King, ſhewing the reach of his Power, (if he ſhould abuſe it) without puniſhment from man. The doing of ſuch things, 1 *Sam.* 8. 10. was in effect tyrannical, not approven by God; but if the King came to abuſe his Power ſo far, he had a permiſſive Law for him, that it was not free to his Subjects to puniſh him: As, albeit the Lord approveth not Divorce, or a mans putting away of his wife, yet by a permiſſive Law, husbands amongſt Gods People, had liberty, *Deut.* 24. 1. to put away their wives, without being obnoxious to humane puniſhment for that cauſe; (albeit God reſerved the puniſhment of the hard-hearted husbands to himſelf) So, the Lord gives no approbation to over-imperious or tyrannical facts of Princes; yet, if they abuſe their Power, he will reſerve them unto dreadful puniſhments by his own hand, but will not have the hands of their Subjects to be upon, or againſt them. As parents do evil in correcting their children, for their pleaſure, *Heb.* 12. 9, 10. and have no moral approven power from God ſo to do; yet, it is a ſort of right of parents, that if they ſo do, their children may not uſe violence upon them, or riſe to deſtroy them, but be in a reverent ſubjection to them.

But this great Theologue tells us, *That it is only the manner of Tyranny, that is here ſet down by Samuel; And that meerly by way of diſſwaſive, to diſſwade them from ſeeking a King.* *Anſ.* 1. It is true, the fact is the manner of Tyranny, but the permiſſive power without puniſhment from Subjects, is the juſt right of all Lawful Kings, of whom, as it may be ſaid, *Nil penas metuunt, nulla quia lege tenentur*: So to them (if they deboard and abuſe their power) it may be ſaid, *Si genus humanum & mortalia temnitis*

arma:

arma: At ſperate deos memores fandi atque nefandi. 2. Let it be ſo, that *Samuel* in ſetting forth the manner or Law of the King, intended to diſſwade the people, from inſiſting in their petition for a King; yet, that was not his only, nor his main intention: his main intention is, to ſhew the People their duty, under a Kings oppreſſion, (though it was not his duty to oppreſſe them) to ſhew them, (I ſay) what they behoved to ſuffer under a King, beyond meaſure imperious, without reſiſtance, (for he is not now teaching the King his duty.) This is clear, for otherwiſe, to what purpoſe ſhould he have written the manner of the King in a Book, and laid it up before the Lord, after the King is ſet over them? 1 *Sam.* 10. 25. when there was no place for repentance, no remedy, no uſe of terrifying or diſſwading them; the only uſe of recording it, was, to teach the people their behaviour towards the King, and patience under him, and that it ſhould not be free for them, to ſhake off the yoke of his Government, or to offer violence to him, albeit he ſhould over-ſtretch his Power too far. This that he recorded, was not the Law of the King, *Deut.* 17. that was already keeped in the Ark with the reſt of the Law, and needed not to be written again in a Book, to lay it up before the Lord. Nor is there any ground for their fancy, who think, *that Samuel did write certain fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, to withſtand the abuſe of abſolute Power, and to temper Monarchy, with a liberty befitting the People*: This is but a gueſs without ground; had there been any ſuch ſpecial fundamental Lawes, the ten Tribes had a fair ground of pleading upon the ſame, before their revolt; but no ſuch thing is heard of, and it is as eaſie to deny it, as it is to affirm, that there was any ſuch thing as theſe imagined fundamental Laws. Beſides, that the People claim no vote in ſuch fundamental Laws or Pactions; and had there been any ſuch thing, it was their intereſt to be conſulted with in the matter; and had they thought of any ſuch Covenants or Laws fundamental, wherein liberty might be left them to reſiſt their Kings, or take order with them, how eaſily could they have ſhewed the weakneſs of *Samuels* diſſwaſion, and ſaid, If the King become evil, we will reſiſt him, and be revenged upon him; for, we take him to reign, but only on ſuch termes, that he reign well; But no ſuch thoughts had they.

I ſhall only adde two or three teſtimonies concerning this place, 1 *Sam.* 8. 10. Mr *Calvin*, *Inſtit. lib.* 4. *c.* 20. S. 26. ſpeaking of this *Jus Regis*, 1 *Sam.* 8. ſayes well, *Certe non id jure facturi erant Reges, quos optime ad omnem continentiam lex inſtituebat, ſed jus in populum vocabatur, cui parere ipſi neceſſe eſſet, nec obſiſtere liceret* (*n. b.*) *ac*

(n. b.) ac ſi dixiſſet Samuel, *eo ſe proripiet licentia regum libido quam cohibere veſtrum non erit (n. b.) quibus hoc reſtabit unum, juſſa excipere & dicto audientes eſſe.* So, *Brentius, Hom.* 27. 1 *Sam. Etiamſi velletis jugum Regis excutere, tamen ut ſemel ſuſceperitis, nequaquam id vobis licebit.* Adde *Diodat* on the place, *that this* jus Regis *was, by conſent of Nations and Gods toleration, become as it were a right in abſolute Kingdoms; God preſcribing to Subjects the Law of patience and obedience, and the Prince being no way ſubject to puniſhment, albeit Gods expreſſe Command, Deut.* 17. *moderates his actions otherwiſe.*

The next thing the Libeller addes in his reſerve, to ſatisfie mens judgements anent his ſeditious poſition of private mens uſing the puniſhing Sword againſt all Magiſtrates, *&c.* is, *the contract and covenant betwixt King and people, &c.* Better occaſion ſhall be given to ſpeak of this in the next Chap. Only now we ſay, it is impertinently alledged to the ſatisfying of men anent his foreſaid poſition: for, whatever intereſt the body of a people have to oppoſe powers above them by that ſuppoſed *contract* and *covenant*, will not juſtifie meer private perſons, and the far fewer and leſſer part, in their inſurrections againſt all Magiſtrates and the Body of the community; for, it is not with them, as ſeparate from the Body, that ſuch a contract (if any be) is made; but it is betweene the King and the People, nor can it enſtate them in a Power of puniſhing all Magiſtrates over them and all their neighbours, (being the Plurality) which this man aims at. But he proceeds to ſeek further protection for ſedition in ſacred Scripture, out of which he would produce three inſtances: Firſt, *the peoples oppoſing Saul in the caſe of Jonathan,* 1 *Sam.* 14. 45. To which we ſay, though *Saul* had made a raſh oath, and had raſhly and ſinfully adjured the people, that they ſhould eat no food till the evening, *v.* 24. (which *L. R.* untruly calls a ſtanding Law, which the People had agreed to, *P.* 349.) yet the people uſe no violence againſt *Saul*, when he goes about to put to death innocent *Jonathan* (who taſted of the honey, not having heard of the adjuration) But in the heat of a ſouldierly boldneſs, (after ſo great a victory obtain'd ſpecially by *Jonathans* valour, who in that day of Battel wrought with God, and wrought great ſalvation in *Iſrael*) do effectually interpoſe with *Saul*, and mediate for the life of *Jonathan*, moving *Saul* to wave reſpect to his raſh oath, and to regard what was juſt and right. The people (as *Junius* ſaith) *adjurat* Saulem *& appellat ipſius conſcientiam coram vivente Deo, ut poſthabita juramenti ratione, juris habeat rationem,* &c. *& ſe interponentes,* Saulem

impediverunt, ne eum morti traderet. They interposed by mediation for so worthy a person, and their mediation was willingly welcomed, and not a word is there more of that matter, *Saul* not counting himself crossed in such mediation for so noble and dear a Son, whom he in his rashness had devoted to death. Neither do the people oppose an oath against *Sauls* oath, for saving *Jonathan*: *Junius* exposition may passe well, that they speak not by way of swearing, but by way of reasoning, abhorring the destruction of such a person. *Absit, ut vivit Jehova, an cadere debet ullus ex capillis capitis ejus, quandoquidem*, &c. As the Lord liveth, should any hair of *Jonathans* head fall to the ground, *&c.* It is a wonder to see understanding men argue from this place, for violent and forcible resistance to Kings, especially when acting according to Laws consented to by private persons; here the King is not acting according to Law, but prosecuting the observation of a foolish and rash oath; Here, the opposition made to the King, is by way of intercession and earnest reasoning, that he ought to regard what was right, more then his rash oath; here, the opposition made by way of intercession, was acceptable and welcome, acquiesced in, and yeelded to; Here, the opposition made, is not only by one part of the people, but the Princes of the Land and Captains of thousands, as *L. R.* saith, *p.* 348. Now what makes all this for a party of meer private persons making insurrection, and using force and violence upon all Magistrates, acting according to established Laws, and affronting, grieving, dishonouring them, yea, professedly aiming at their destruction? Let *Peter Martyr* be looked upon this place, and he speaks notably well, his own words will discover, how notourly he is falsified by *L. R. p.* 349. But yet again, the Libeller produceth the example *of the ten tribes rejecting Rehoboam*, 1 *Kings* 12. as a laudable example to justifie his position. Be-like now the matter goes farther on, then private mens innocent self-defence against violence, for the defection of the ten tribes is held forth as imitable (we see what is the tendency of this mans Principles.) But no sound man will think, the suddain and furious Rebellion of the ten tribes from *Davids* house, upon the rash and furious answer of a young King, was justifiable, (although the Lord in his Providence ordered it so.) And upon the revelation hereof, it was acquiesced in, and arms were not used against the dividing party; and it would be consider'd also, that they who made the secession, were the major part of the body of the people. But, what is all this to justifie the insurrections of any lesser party of private people, against the Magistrate, and all Magistrates supreme and subordinate, as this

this man would have them to do? Every example recorded in Scripture is not imitable.

As to the revolt of *Libnah*, 2 *Chron.* 21. 10. this is reported in Scripture as a fact, but is not justified and approven, although it be said, *they revolted, because* Jehoram *had forsaken the Lord God of his fathers.* This imports not the impulsive cause of the revolt, or motive which they had before their eyes, (for, in that same verse and period, it is said, *The* Edomites *also revolted from him, because he had forsaken the Lord God of his fathers:* and the *Edomites* loved not the true Religion) But the meritorious cause on *Jehorams* part of that piece of judgement coming on him, is pointed at; as oft-times God punisheth mens sins by the sinful actions of other men against them; the instruments are sinful, but his justice is holy. But let the Libeller tell us in good earnest, if he thinks that the laying aside of the Presbyterian frame, is the forsaking of the Lord God of our fathers, and a sufficient cause for any one Town in the Kingdom to revolt from the King, (though he do not persecute them nor force them to his way, as there is no evidence that *Libnah* was thus used) shall a Kings swerving in that one point, or if there be greater infidelity, be sufficient ground of defection from him? *Cave dixeris. Libnah* was a City of the Priests, *Josh.* 10. (perhaps much of the temper of this sort of men) but their revolt was sinful, because with the secession from the Common-wealth, they fell off from the Church of God, from *Jerusalem*, the Temple, and publick Worship and place of it, which was (as yet) owned by God, notwithstanding many corruptions: the revolt is only recorded as done, nor as well done. As to what he adds, of the Practices, Prophesies, and manner of the late blessed Reformations, and the Right and Constitution of this Kingdom, afterward it shall be considered. But it is a wonder, that upon this point of resistance and taking arms against Kings, he hath omitted *Davids* taking *Goliaths* Sword, and gathering bands of men for his own defence against *Sauls* violence; which because he medleth not with, neither shall we, further then to note what *Beza* in his answer to *Castellio*, P. 30. sayes, *Davidis unctio ita eum à privatis distinguebat, ut jure posset armis vim injustam repellere.* And it were to be wished, that this Libeller, who mocks at the exemption of Kings from punishment by Subjects (as we will hear) may let *Davids* word sink in his heart, *Who shall stretch forth his hand against the Lords anointed, and be innocent?*

Now to draw to a close of this matter, let these few things be observed, 1. That whatever may be said of the lawfulness of defensive

arms, against the illegal violences and extreme oppression of a Prince, who is not *integræ Majestatis*, by other Magistrates to whom with him the protection of Laws and Liberties is jointly committed, by certain pactions and conditions expressed; that will say nothing to warrand the insurrection of any party of private persons against all their Magistrates, acting according to Laws agreed upon by the Magistrates of all degrees, and the body of the Community.

2. That the late rising against, and resisting the King and all Authorities in the Land, was utterly unwarrantable, not only upon the account of their being meer private persons who did take arms, but because there was neither sufficient ground for that deed, (had it in its nature been lawful) nor did they abide within due limits of an innocent defence. The Author of *L. R.* tells us, *P.* 329. *When there is no actual invasion made by a man seeking our life, we are not to use violent re-offending.*

Again, he saith, P. 327, 328. *Private men must not presently use violence to the Kings servants, till they supplicate; nor may use re-offending, if flight may save; and must not use violent re-offending against the servants of the King, but in the exigence of last and most inexorable necessity.* And, P. 321. *Any mean not used for preventing death, must be an act of revenge, not of self-defence.* And adds there, *That in paying tribute, or suffering a buffet of a rough Master, we are not to use any act of re-offending*, &c. Now the world knows, the life or blood of these people was not sought upon any termes, there was no forcing them to idolatry, to false worship, nor frighting them to any thing of that kind upon pain of their lives; only for their contempt of the outward Ordinances of God, purely administred in an Orthodox Church, they were put to pay such moderate fines, as the publick Laws had appointed; without any actual invasion of them or their persons, they were the first aggressors and invaders, wounding and murthering the Kings Servants and Ministers, and seising on his chief Officer. *Naphth. p.* 137. confesseth they shed *the first blood*, and first murthered *the Kings Servants*. They had never before that essayed supplicating these in power, for mitigation of their fines (which was not forbidden them to do, if so be they would have done it without tumults and combinations) but being inflamed by furious Agitators, they would flee to the Sword, and provoke others to combinations with them: And so, (spoiling loyal persons who would not concur with them, and their hearts being full of much more mischief) they marched on to mock Authority with armed Petitions, as they had mocked God

by

by ſinful prayers to proſper their evil courſe, (as if he had been altogether ſuch a one as themſelves) But not only have others, but themſelves alſo, cauſe to praiſe God that they had no ſucceſs in ſin, which might have been a ſnare and a ſtumbling block to them and others alſo. It is Gods great mercy not to thrive in an evil way.

3. All the people of God are to advert carefully, to the dangerous principle of this Libeller, and his adherents, which is this, (all alongs his Book) *That it is as (or more) irrational and unlawful, to ſuffer unjuſtly from the Magiſtrate, (ſo long as there is ſtrength enough to act againſt him) as it is to obey actively, his unlawful commandments* : This doctrine cannot but be a ſource and ſpring of perpetual ſeditions, under every kind of Government, Civil and Eccleſiaſtical: For thus, every man is made judge of his own ſuffering and paſſion, as well as of his own practice, and no man muſt ſuffer, more then he thinks he deſerveth; (but counteract all Authority, if he be ſtrong enough to do it.) And no man is to ſubmit to unjuſt ſufferings, by abuſed Authority, but *ad redimendam majorem vexationem*, and when he cannot otherwiſe mend himſelf by the uſe of violence againſt the Magiſtrate: Thus no malefactor ought to ſubmit to puniſhment if he think it unjuſtly inflicted by the Magiſtrate, but do violence to him if he can; and, no Miniſter is to forbear preaching, if he judge himſelf unjuſtly depoſed; and no Chriſtian forbear intruding himſelf on the Communion, if he judge himſelf unjuſtly dealt with by Church-Judicatories: This is a ſubverſion of all order in humane and Chriſtian Societies, for all is made dependent upon the fancies and thoughts of private ſufferers; who are like enough, to be very favourable judges to themſelves, in prejudice of publick Order, which (notwithſtanding) any tender-hearted Chriſtian will regard more then his own private will or well-being; however, *Naphtali* mocks at Gods order, *pag.* 152. aſſerting, *the obſervance thereof, to be but a diſpenſable formality, when he and his party takes it in their heads, that it is conducible to break the obſervance of Gods order, for Gods glory*: What woful confuſion ſhall we be reduced to, if ſuch fanſies poſſeſſe the heads of heady people? Theſe great teachers, would aſſure us, it is an act of Grace and Vertue to reſiſt the Magiſtrate, unjuſtly afflicting us: And that it is both well conſiſtent with the honour due to the Magiſtrate, by the fifth Commandment, to knock him down by violent force of Armes, when we think he wrongs us; and alſo, a neceſſary commanded duty, (by vertue of the ſixth Command) ſo to do, when he offers violence

to

to our life, (although he proceed by Law, which we count an unjuſt Law.) This is the doctrine of *L. R.* and of his fellow witneſſes, whom *Napht.* calls Martyrs: It is true, *L. R. pag.* 322. ſtrives to allay and mollifie the matter, (wherein he is not ſo far wrong as *Naphtali*) aſſerting, *That in leſſer injuries, (beneath mutilation, or loſſe of life) as bearing tributes, or loſſes in eſtate, &c. a man hath given him of God a greater comparative dominion, then over his life: And that he may as to theſe matters, ſuffer unjuſtly from the Magiſtrate, without reſiſtance, and ought to do ſo;* (and this was the only caſe of the weſtern Sufferers, if they may at all be looked on, as unjuſtly ſuffering) *although he ought not to ſuffer death unjuſtly, if he can help himſelf, becauſe God hath not made this eligible by any man.* But certainly, his writing involves groſſe contradictions, for the ground of reſiſting the Magiſtrate purſuing a mans life unjuſtly, which he doth lay down, (*viz.* That there is no more obligation lying on us, to ſuffer unjuſtly from an abuſed power, (if we can violently reſiſt him) then to do unjuſtly upon the unlawful command of the Power) doth reach not only to the caſe of taking away the life, but taking away the goods unjuſtly; for if it be true, (as he ſayes) that by vertue of the ſixth Command, we are oblieged to reſiſt the Magiſtrate, when we think he takes our life unjuſtly; certainly by vertue of the eight Command, we are oblieged to reſiſt him, when he takes our goods unjuſtly, or layes on oppreſſive tributes; and by vertue of the ninth Command, are oblieged to reſiſt him violently, if reproach or infamy be rubbed on our name and reputation, (which to men, uſes to be dearer then life or ſtate) by him. And ſeing this Witneſs and his fellows, do ſpeak of ſubmiſſion to ſentences of Judges, which they reckon unjuſt, as a matter at leaſt of equal guiltineſs, (where there is Power to reſiſt violently) unto the guiltineſſe of active obedience given to unlawful Commands; no degree of ſuch unjuſt ſuffering, is eligible, more then any degree of wicked obedience, to unjuſt commands: God hath not given to us a comparative dominion over our actions, that we ſhould do a leſſe ſin rather then a greater; (ſeing all ſin is to be abhorred) So, if by divine precept, we be bound to reſiſt Powers, inflicting on us greater puniſhments unjuſtly; we are alſo oblieged to reſiſt them, in inflicting the leſſer puniſhments, (if they do unjuſtly.) And non-defenſe, even againſt leſſer injuries, (being ſin) it is not eligible, and if non-defenſe againſt greater injuries be ſin, againſt the leſſer it muſt be ſin alſo. So by this doctrine, nothing at all is to be ſuffered at the hand of the Magiſtrate,

(if

(if we think, he deals unjuſtly with us, and if we have power enough to maſter him) but a continual repugnancy there muſt be in all Subjects againſt all Magiſtrates (when they apprehend wrong is done to them) and violence upon violence muſt be offered them, where there is force and ſtrength enough in the perſons accuſed as guilty: yea, no man is to ſuffer any thing from Powers above them, without a phyſical neceſſity of force upon him; nor muſt in ſubmiſſion do any thing that may be diſpoſitive or preparatory to his own ſuffering. No man, if he think himſelf injured, (though ſentenced to baniſhment) is to go on his own feet, till he be by force ejected; no man, fined in pecuniary Mulcts, is to pay them till he be under force, and his money plucked from him; no man is to go the place of execution (when ſentenced by the Judge) till he be trailed by force, if he think himſelf innocent; nor lay down his head on a block, till he be violented: For, albeit he be not in probable capacity to deliver himſelf from death, or from theſe other puniſhments; yet, every man is in capacity probable enough to command his own loco-motive faculty not to ſtir toward the accompliſhment of the execution of the unjuſt ſentence, till there be a force upon him. And it is *Naphtali's* Principle, that ſo far as probable capacity is to reſiſt violently, there ſhould be no ſubmiſſion; and then there muſt be patience per-force. Can ſuch Doctrines, or the tendencies thereof, reliſh to the people of God, or to any rational people?

CHAP. III.

That ſuch as are inveſted with ſacred and inviolable Soveraignty, have divine exemption and priviledge of impunity from their own Subjects.

THe matter in dealing with Magiſtrates (according to *Naphtali's* mind) reſts not in a meer reſiſtance of them by meer private perſons, but goes on to retaliating and revenging upon them, wrongs ſuppoſed to be done, not only upon all inferior Magiſtrates, but upon the Supreme, who is inveſted with Majeſty and Soveraignty over all under God. For this man, again and again, jeers at the Soveraign Powers priviledge and Impunity of divine exemption; (See *Napht.* Pag. 28, 29.) and (reflecting not obſcurely upon the horrid murther of our late Soveraign, inſinuated as the *memorable inſtance of the times whereof he now ſpeaks*, no other inſtance being producible

ducible at any time he now ſpeaks of) aſſerts, *That according to Gods Word, the approbation of Gods providence, and of his people animated by himſelf, the pretended exemption and impunity of Princes is made void, their Carcaſes removed, and their Scepters broken*, P. 29. And, P. 151. he allows *any private perſons to ſtep forward, and remove them who abuſe their Authority and occupy their places, and aſſert the intereſts which theſe wicked perſons (Magiſtrates) have ſo traitrouſly forfeited and deſerted.* And when they do ſo, (though but private perſons) he avows, *they are acting in their places and callings, according to the Covenant.*

Moſt of the venome this man hath againſt the Powers ordained of God, he hath ſucked out of the breaſts of *Lex Rex.* It were not right to dig up all the peſtilent untruths of that Piece, ſet forth in moſt impertinent and ſophiſtical reaſonings, mixt with infinite inhumane bitterneſs againſt the late King: only, as it were to be wiſhed, that ſuch errors might be buried in eternal oblivion; So it is to be regrated, that too too many of the Miniſtery and others in *Scotland*, have been poiſoned with ſuch Principles: and the ſame not being very like to be ſuddenly extirpate, the more need have the Powers above us to be watchful.

To come to the matter then. 1. It would be obſerved, that in all political Societies, there is according to Gods Ordinance, a ſupreme Subject of Majeſty; in all theſe Societies, the chief Power is either ſubjected in one perſon, or in moe perſons in an united way. The God of order hath, in all humane political Societies, appointed under himſelf a ſupreme Power, whither ſubjected in a ſingle perſon, or in a complex company, which is as one by political union. This ſupreme Power (or they who are veſted with it) orders the whole body, and hath nothing before or above it, in the nature and order of civil Power and Authority. And this firſt and ſupreme Power governs all in the Society, and is governed by none therein. In all order, there is a neceſſity to arrive at ſomething that is firſt, before which, or above which, there is nothing in that order; *In ordine, impoſſibile eſt abire in infinitum.* To ſay that in civil Societies, a perſon is firſt and chief, and hath the Majeſty of the Society reſident in him, and withall, that that ſame perſon hath a Superior or equal, is to ſpeak contradictions; for then the Power, or Perſon endowed with power ſhould be both Supreme and not Supreme, in the ſame kind of civil order. Wiſe men have ſaid, that the multitude of gods is the nullity of gods; a multitude of infinites ſo called, makes none of them infinite. The Gentiles, who had many gods, were indeed

Atheiſts,

Atheists and without God in the World. So a multitude of Supreme Powers in one humane civil Society, destroyes the divine order set by God himself, and allowed by the light of reason in humane Societies; a chimæra of idle distinctions is whelped by the late masters of confusion, *of co-ordinate and collateral Soveraignes in one Kingdom, the fountality of Royalty in the people* (resumable at their pleasure,) *is talked of, also Kings and People, their being mutual Magistrates to punish one another.* And besides, *ordinary Courts of Justice* (where the Magistrate, Gods Sword-bearer bears sway) *Courts of necessity and Tribunals of Nature, where People are Judges, Accusers, and all,* are bigly talked of, but these are only cloaks of fig-leaves to cover horrid Rebellion and Disorder.

It is certain supreme Power is indivisible and incommunicable to distinct Subjects in any one political Society. There is no political Society, but the Soveraign Power must rest either in one single person, who hath no Peer, let be Superior, or in the plurality either of the best or chiefest, or of the most and greatest number, and which are in a manner one by aggregation. And there is no part of the Society or persons equal to, or above these in whom the Supremacy is. In a democratick constitution, the supreme Majesty is in the body or plurality of the People, So we often hear in *Tullie* of *majestas populi Romani*; In an Aristocratick constitution, the Majesty and right of Majesty is in the body or plurality of the Nobles, or Lords, or *Patritii*, or however they be named in several such states. And in a Monarchy, the Soveraign Majesty is indivisibly and incommunicably resident in the person of the King, who hath none co-ordinate with him in the politick-body, nor superior to him, he is *solo Deo minor*, which was the loyal faith of the primitive Christians concerning their Emperors, as *Tertullian* tells us, and was the antient Language of our Parliaments concerning the King, (as may be seen in *regiam majest. lib.* 1. *c.* 1.) the loyal simplicity of the antient Christians, and of our antient forebeers in this Land, would have accounted the distinctions of the needle-headed seditious which we hear for levelling Royalty, very monsters.

But why should we doubt, that where there is a King, (one truly so) his Soveraignty is matchlesse on earth, when the Scriptures calls him Supreme? 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. Is there any equal to the Supreme in order of civil Government, by whom he is judgeable or punishable? if there be any, he is not Supreme, nor the Government Royal, *Monogamy* admittes no Rival, so neither doth Monarchy, truly and properly so called.

2. It is certain, no man can be judged or punished but by his own

Judge who is above him, and hath Authority over him by lawful commission from God, or from men authorized by God, to give such commission: Now, who shall be judge to the person or persons invested with Soveraign Majesty, *seing every Soul under them, is Commanded to be subject to them*, Rom. 13. 1. *and seing the supreme Power of the Sword, is committed unto them, and not to others, but by deputation and in dependence upon them*? In an aristocratical constitution of Government, (as is at *Venice*) who shall be judges to the *Patritii* or Senators, if they, or the major part deviate or do wrong? In a democracy, (such as sometimes was at *Rome*, *Athens*, and other places) where the people are the supreme receptacle of Majesty, or the pluralitie of them, who shall judge them, wen they do wrong, either to particular persons, or to considerable parts of the people; as at *Athens*, *Socrates* was put to death, for avowing the only true and one God; just *Aristides*, was billetted into banishment, for no cause; valiant *Themistocles* had that fame lot, and many moe? and how often in such a constitution, hath the corrupt majority or plurality, extreamly wronged considerable parts of the people? yet, who had power to punish them? who could be Judges between the doers and sufferers of the wrong? Is there not in both these Governments, a necessity of impunity and exemption, for these invested with the Soveraginty, (as to their subjects) unlesse a door be opened to most horrid confusions and dissolutions of States? So also, in a true Monarchy, there must be an exemption and impunity (as to subjects) of the person invested with Soveraignity and Majesty: Gods law, natures light and sound reason, are all for this, that the person (or persons) invested with soveraign Majesty, having the Legislative-power, the Jurisdictional-power, the Coercive and Punitive-power originally in himself; must enjoy exemption and impunity, (as to subjects actings against them.) The contrary tenet overthrows the order of God and nature, and precipitates humane Societies in a gulf of endlesse confusions.

3. This hath been the constant sense of the generation of the righteous, and the antient Christians, and great lights of Gods Church, whom none will call flatterers of Princes, but such as have lost their fore-heads: *Tertul. apol. contra gentes, imperatores sunt, in solius Dei potestate, a quo sunt secundi, post quem primi, ante omnes Deos, & super omnes homines*: And a little after, *Majestatem Cæsaris soli Deo subjicio*: So, *ad* Scapulam, *Imperator omnibus major est, dum solo deo est minor*: So, *Optat. contra Parmenian. super imperatorem,*

non

non est nisi solus Deus qui fecit imperatorem. And, *Jerom. epist. ad Rusticum*, speaking of *Davids* words, *Ps.* 51. *Against thee, against thee onely have I sinned*; sayes he spake so, *quia Rex erat, & alium non timebat.* And *Ambrose, in Apol. Davidis, cap.* 4. & 10. speaking of the same words, sayes, *Rex utique erat, nullis ipse legibus tenebatur*, (he means, as to fear punishment from man) *quia liberi sunt Reges a vinculis delictorum; neque enim, ullis ad panam vocantur Legibus tuti Imperii potestate, homini ergo non peccavit, qui non tenebatur obnoxius.* There is no doubt, but *David* was sensible both of the horrid injury he had done to *Uriah*, (the occasion of that *Psalm*) and of the scandal he had given to Gods people, in which sense, he might be well said to sin against both: But in this word, *against thee, thee only have I sinned*; As he minds to acknowledge, that God onely was conscious to his sin in committing it: So also, he shews, that this above all touched his conscience, that he had violated Gods Law; and shews, that he is touched with his terrors, as his only Judge, though (as *Diodat* on the place sayes well) *as he was a King, he was exempted from the punishment of man, and not obnoxious to humane Tribunals*: And excellent Mr. *Calvin*, in that 20. Ch. of the 4. Book of his institut. *S.* 27. *Assumptum in Regiam Majestatem, violare nefas est, nunquam nobis seditiosæ istæ cogitationes in mentem venient, tractandum esse pro meritis Regem.* S. 29. *Personam sustinent voluntate Domini, cui inviolabilem Majestatem ipse impressit & insculpsit.* And if Princes be tyrannous, *nostrum non est hujusmodi malis mederi*, &c. and so, S. 31. fully to our purpose, it is a wonder how many who pretend respect to *Calvin*, (as he is indeed most worthy of respect) should dare to violate the Sacrosanct Maiesty of Kings, if they will but read over that Chapter, wherein he speaks most notably against the seditious Doctrines of our times, as if he had been living in them.

4. It is not denyed, that the King is bound before God, to rule his people according to the Law of God, of reason and nature; yea, and to take his direction in Government, from the rational Laws of the Kingdom, (which are deductions from, or determinations of, the Law of God, reason and nature, to particular circumstances) agreed to, by the consent and with the good liking of his people. It is too grosse a saying, *Regi quicquid libet, licet*; a good King will turn the word, and say, *Regi quod licet* (supposing it expedient) *libet*, he will make use of good Laws, as his instruments, in governing the people, and account it his honour and a thing greatly becoming his Majesty, to do

nothing contrary to Law, in the ordinary course of his Government, and not at all stray there-from, but when great reason urges an equitable interpretation of the Law, and respect to the end and aim of it, when precise cleaving to the rigidity of the letter thereof, might make *summum jus, summa injuria*: It is a royal thing for a King, to live by the same good Laws which are given by him to the people; and it is of efficacious influence upon them, to move them to walk in their duties orderly; *Rex tenetur servare Leges, si non ut Leges, tamen ut rationes.* But, if the supreme Power should deviat, we maintain that as a sure truth, which this man proudly and traiterously jeers at; That impunity (as from Subjects) necessarily attends Soveraignity and supreme Majesty; which hath this inseparable priviledge of exemption from violence by Subjects, by the Law of God, Reason and Nature, whatever sort the Government be, Monarchical or Polyarchical: For, no man can be judged or punished, but by a Judge above him, and the Supreme hath none such, otherwise he were not Supreme. To teach contrary to this, is but to confound Gods Order, and dissipate humane Societies, by continual rebellions.

Yet, this inviolableness of the sacred persons of Kings, and supreme Powers invested with Soveraign Authority from God, thus asserted, should be so far from licensing or incouraging them to do what they list, that they have the greater cause to walk with holy fear within the boundaries of Gods Law, and their own just Laws; for the more immunity they have from mens violence, (which must be granted, unless all things be turned into confusion) the sadder punishments they shall have from God, if they debord. The sixth Chapter of the Book of *Wisdom* (though it be Apocrypha) is well worthy to be read by Kings and Potentates, and to be trembled at; for the matter is very agreeable to Gods Word. The heaviest vengeances that are recorded in History, sacred and profane, have come upon flagitious and tyrannous Kings: their exemption from mens hands reserves them to fall into the hands of the living God, which is a fearful thing; who (besides the wrath that is to come) sometimes calls for forreign scourges upon them; sometimes suffers an evil spirit of rebellion to go out amongst their own Subjects, who though they do wickedly, in stretching forth their hands against the sacred head of the Lords Anointed, yet it is ordinary for the great God, to do the work of his holy Justice by wicked hands, and when men are serving their own lusts, and crossing his revealed will, (for which vengeance attends them) yet they may be in these actions serving his Providence, and his Justice against wicked Powers,

albeit

albeit they think not so, nor comes it into their minds or hearts: But Potentates should remember the word, *Potentes parce debent uti potestate sua, ut semper eam retinere possint.*

But, the Libeller will have the memorable instance of the times, whereof he now speaks, (*Naph.* P. 30.) *of casting away the Carcases, and breaking the Scepters of Kings*, to be remembred; and sayes, *such a thing had the approbation of divine Providence, of his Word, and of his People animated thereto by himself.* Albeit his speech be subdolous and double-faced, leaving it doubtful of what times he speaks, wherein this memorable instance of murthering Kings and dethroning them is to be found, (at the time of Reformation, whereat he seems to hint, no such thing was there) yet, it is too palpable he points at the horrid instance of the murther committed upon the sacred Person of our late King, by the vile and desperate Sectaries, (*the instance* (saith he) *of the times we now speak of, is worthily recorded*) another instance, in the times of first Reformation, of such murther, we know not. But, it is most falsly and wickedly said, (whether that particular be meant or not) that Gods Providence or Gods Word approves the murthering or deposing of Princes; or that he thereunto animates his people. Gods Word never warranded any Subjects to take the Sword to destroy their Soveraigns, or to adjudge them to death under any pretence, (they not being their Judges above them, but under them) and what Gods Word approves not, his Providence doth not approve, (although he may, and doth in his holy Providence, permit many things to be, which he approves not in his Word, which is our rule, and not his Providence.) And to say, God animates his people to such horrid actions, is blasphemy, making God the author of sin: he animates none to any thing that is against his Word (the ordinary rule of our walking) albeit extraordinarily he may stir up the spirits of some to actions, not according to the ordinary rule (as in the times of the Judges) but they were sure of their warrand from him, the like whereof none have ground to wait for now. But, God save the King from such people so animated, (as this man would have them) he may call them the people of God, that carry such murthering-hearts towards Princes; but it is to be feared, God will say to them, *Depart from me, I know you not.*

One of *Naphtali's* commended Pseudomartyrs, the *Apology*, labours to produce many instances of the Parliaments of *Scotland*, punishing Princes for their enormities; all which he sets forth as laudable and imitable presidents and examples: Yet, the most that all of them

amounts

amounts to, is nothing but the insurrection of Nobles (*Procres*, as *Buchannan* calls them) against the Kings, and violent oppressions of such of them as have been flagitious and tyrannous, (such were several of them, as it happens every where, and was so in *Judah*, where were more evil Kings then good, by far.) But neither *Buchannan* nor this *Apolog.* can produce any one instance of our lawful Parliaments or Peoples taking on them, in a judicial way, in cold blood, and under forms of process, to punish or destroy their Kings, howsoever evil. Whatever insurrections have been wherein Kings have perished, and not a few people also, (as oft-times the cure of Tyranny is worse to the people, then Tyranny it self, *Minori cum periculo tyrannus toleratur quam ejicitur*) yet God hath, since the foundation of our Kingdom to this day, preserved our Parliaments and People from such a way against their Kings, even when they were under Paganisme (for some ages) even when Popery did over-grow the Land, choaking and darkening the light of the Gospel, after it was come amongst us; and when the Land was in many ages under much barbarity, it never came in the hearts of Parliaments or People, to sit as Judges on their Soveraigns in cold blood, and advisedly with forms of Process, to attempt their destruction, (however evil they were.) The more shame do they cast upon these, who in the fair day-light of the Gospel, endeavour to poison souls with such a Doctrine of devils; or who instigate to, or approve of such wayes against the Powers ordained by God.

But to pull out this Libeller and his Complices from the Sanctuary of the Word of God, which (he sayes) does approve the destroying of Princes, and makes void their exemption and impunity as to men, (their Subjects.) Let it be considered, what colour there is for this horrid Tenet from the Word of God. A little we must reflect upon his Magazine, whence he borrowes all his stuffe, printing that pretious matter that is there over and over again under different shapes. *L. R. quest.* 26. is bold to say, *That the Sanhedrim might and should have put David to death for the matter of Uriah. For* (sayes he) *he sees no exception God makes in the Law, of great or small, but the murtherer should be put to death, according to* Gen. 9. 6. Numb. 35. 30, 31. *and if men make difference, he craves leave to say,* à facto ad jus non sequitur; *and though it be an humane politick constitution, that the King be free of all coaction of Law, because it conduceth for the peace of the Commonwealth: Yet, if we make it a matter of conscience, I see no exception that God makes, the persons of the Great must not be excepted,* Deut. 1. 17. 1 Chron. 19. 6, 7. Levit. 19. 15. *So also,*

so, P. 348. and 428. and 238. And often elsewhere, he will have the estates executing the moral Law (as he calls it) *on the King, and punishing him, not only resisting him. And why? because he sayes most Thrasonically, P. 460. I have unanswerably proved, that the Kingdom is superior to the King, and the people may be their own Judge in the Tribunal of necessity.* To which, we say, 1. What should he mean to make it conducible to the Peace of the Common-wealth, that the King be free of the coaction of Law, and yet not so, if it be made a matter of Conscience? Is the preservation of the Peace of the Common-wealth, no matter of Conscience to him? or, Is not the constitution, freeing the King from coaction of Law (for that end) warrandable? 2. It is good that this Metaphysical Statist, was no chief Priest or Levite, or such a member of the Sanhedrim in *Davids* time, for he would certainly have afforded a corrupt exposition of the Law, in reference to the King, that he might be cut off; What sots, or cold-rife senseless men were the Priests and the Prophets of that time, who did not instigate the Sanhedrim, to execute the moral Law on *David*, that wrath might be turned away from the Land? this man could (in his sublime speculations) have instructed the Sanhedrim better in their duty, and could have told them, that albeit *David* was not bound to draw his Sword against himself, yet the Judges under him should not accept his person, because he was a great man; he could have told them the Sanhedrim is above the King, to punish him as well as another man for his sin, and in point of Conscience, and by Gods Law, they were bound to do it. 3. He utterly mistakes the meaning of the Word of God, *Gen. 9. 6.* (as for the other Texts, they clearly concern Magistrates only toward such, over whom they have power, but does neither instigate the inferior Magistrates against the superior, nor the People against any of them) where it is said, *He that sheds mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed*; concluding hence, that there is here a Precept, that the blood of every man (though he be in the supreme Power) should be shed by his Inferiors, if he shed blood innocently and without cause; for, supposing this word, not only to be predictional or interminative, foretelling and threatning, what should come upon shedders of innocent blood (as some expone it) but also diatactick and preceptive; there must be meet limitations of the sentence, both in the subject and the attribute, that it may agree with other sentences of holy Scripture. The subject is, (*he that sheds mans blood*) which is not to be understood of every one that sheds mans blood, but only of such as have no authority, and do it out of private revenge (for we must not own the fancies

fancies of Photinians and Anabaptists, that condemn lawful wars, or capital punishments by the hand or Authority of Magistrates, albeit they argue from this place.) Again, the attribute, or that which is affirmed or commanded, concerning the shedder of mans blood (*by man shall his blood be shed*) is to be consider'd. Certainly, taking the words as a Precept, it is not meant, that it is the duty of every man, or any man indifferently, to shed the blood of the person, who sheds innocent blood; but the man who is to shed the Blood of that person, is the Magistrate, who is his Judge above him. All interpreters are agreed, that here is (if not the institution, yet) the approbation of the office of the civil Magistrate, and his capital punishing of murtherers. *Pareus* saith, *Sancitur hic lex civilis, ut homicidæ plectantur capitaliter per hominem, non quemvis, sed gladio divinitus armatum*; h. e. *per Magistratum*. Peter Martyr, *loci com. p.* 634. *non temere nec per quemvis est effundendus homicidæ sanguis* (*id enim esset valde absurdum*) *quare colligendum est ex illis verbis, Magistratum non obscure esse a Deo institutum, qui animadvertat in homicidas.* So, Musculus, Bezelius, Diodat, *and every one almost, will have the man impowered here to shed the* blood of the murtherer, to be the Magistrate and the Judge. And the Chaldee Paraphrast hath well expon'd it, *qui effuderit sanguinem hominis, per testes juxta sententiam Judicum, sanguis ejus fundetur.* And *Bezelius* sayes well on the place, *that here God is communicating his right and power to the Magistrate, giving him* jus vitæ & necis, *and power to kill murtherers. Certum hominem intelligit* (saith he) *qui ad eam executionem constitutus est.* So the man, that in this Text, hath power to shed the blood of the homicide or murtherer, is the Magistrate or Judge that is above him, constitute by God in politick power, over the Society whereof he is a member. But if the persons invested with supreme Power of the Sword, abusing their power, become guilty of shedding innocent blood; who (in that Society, whereof they are heads) shall judge or punish them? Who is superior over the Supreme to punish him? It is true, God will take the matter in his own hand in his time, (and so taking the words as a prediction or threatning, they may be comprehensive of the supreme Power it self, and of men in that power abusing the same.) But it is inexplicable, how that any, in whom the Soveraign Majesty and magistratical Power resides, or who is therewith invested, should according to order be punished by Subjects, who are not appointed to be his Judges nor to be Gods Sword-bearers, for executing Justice. The Text alwayes supposes, that he who is the avenger of blood-shed, must be Judge

above

above him that ſhed it, being in one body of one Society civil.

When the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 13. ſayes, *let every Soul be ſubject to ſuperiour Powers*, that (*every Soul*) doth not comprehend the ſupreme Power it ſelf, (for how can the man inveſted with it, be ſubject to a ſuperior Power?) but it is meant, that every Soul under the ſuperior Power or Supreme, ſhould be ſubject to it: And let men (as they will) indulge themſelves in their ſeditious notions, they muſt at laſt fiſt in ſome ſupreme Power on earth, which is not judgeable nor puniſhable by any: if ſoveraign Majeſty be placed in Parliament or people, (who may be guilty of ſhedding innocent blood, as well as a King) who ſhall ſhed their blood, (I pray you) when they tranſgreſſe? where ſhall we have Judges to ſit upon them, and to puniſh them, unleſſe this be referred to the ſounder and ſmaller part of the people? (as this man ſaith, p. 240.) And then, there is ground enough laid for eternal confuſion; any leſſer part when they have, or think they have wit and ſtrength enough to through their buſineſs, will undoubtedly call themſelves the ſounder part, and labour to bear down the corrupt plurality, (as we did ſee not many years ago, in our Church-buſineſs) God pitty us, if theſe Principles be embraced and put in practcie. But the chriſtian Reader may eaſily ſee, how hard this Author is put to it, and for all his ſaying, that according to Gods law, Kings muſt be puniſhed as well as others; yet, is he forced to acknowledge, a ſupremacy of Power in ſome, not puniſhable by any but by God: For, *L. R.* p. 389. when he hath given all power to the Parliament over the King, he objects to himſelf, *who ſhall puniſh and coerce the Parliament, in caſe of exorbitance*? he anſwers, *poſterior Parliaments, and* p. 211. he ſayeth, *by the people and conſcience of the people, are they to be judged*, (let all our Nobles and Parliaments hearken to this.) Now, who ever heard of this, that one Parliament poſterior, ſhould puniſh the prior? Their acts they may retract indeed, but to puniſh them for their acts, it is moſt abſurd; becauſe, the prior Parliament, in the capacity of that Judicatory, had as much power as the poſterior; States-men will wonder at ſuch Doctrine, that members of a Parliament ſhould be puniſhed for their free votes, by a ſucceeding Parliament; and far more at the ſubjecting them to the conſcience of the people, (as he ſpeakes.) But then another objection he makes, *poſterior Parliaments, and people both may erre*; he anſwers, *all that is true, God only muſt remeed that*: Well then, if Parliament or people, deſtroy and murther perſons innocently, God only muſt remeed that, there is no Power on earth to call them to an account. Who ſees not,

that at last this Author is driven to acknowledge a Power (which if it deviate) cannot be judged by any on earth, and there is no remedy but in God, against its unjust violence? although he will not acknowledge this Power to be in the King; yet, in the people, as contradistinct from Parliaments, he acknowledges it; whereby also, it may be seen, that his Principles lead him to own a meer democracy, (which is the worst of Governments) as the only lawful Government; he placeth and fixeth the unpunishable Soveraignty there. Kings and Parliaments may be, (according to him) punished by the people; but, they have a Power attended with impunity from men, if they erre, God must amend that onely: we see where we are, and that the resolution of all supreme Power is upon the people under God, (according to these mens tenets) the rabble of the multitude, against King and all Nobles and Rulers, are instated in the Soveraignty under God; yea, *Napht.* goes further, giving to any part of meer private persons, power over King and all Magistrates and Nobles, to judge, depose and punish them, or the major part of the people, (if there be strength enough) and that uncontrollably upon their own judgement of discretion, as we have heard, and will hear further.

But now, *ventum est ad triarios*, we come to the great Guns, whereby *Napht.* and his witnesses, *L. R.* and the *Apol.* strives to batter down Gods order, and to make soveraign Powers, (in the case of abuse of Power) punishable by their inferiors and subjects, (a thing which all the Lords and Superiors in *Scotland*, had need to look to; for, with as good reason may their tennents and vassals, be exhorted to rise against them, and take order with them, when they think they do them wrong, as subjects may be exhorted to rise against thei King.) *Lex Rex* harps much upon the Covenant, betwixt the King and the people, and betwixt both together with God, quest. 14. and 40. asserting, *That the King is only a King conditionally and Covenant-wise; that this Covenant, giveth the people a coactive Power over the King to punish him, if he fail in his duty, and that if it be not performed on his part,* (although it be but a tacite and implicite Covenant) *the people for their part are loosed from the Covenant*: These, and many such Doctrines consequent on these, he hath in these questions. But, *Naph.* out-stripes his leader, for albeit he also harpes upon that supposed Covenant, p. 19. p. 30. and elsewhere, laying much of the stresse of resistance against, and revenge upon the King abusing his power, upon that rotten foundation; Yet, he goes a greater length then *L. R.* doth; for, *L. R.* takes the

Covenant

Covenant as the warrand for the body of the people, with their Rulers of inferior degree, to reſiſt and puniſh the King; but *Naph.* pleads the Covenant for any party of meer private perſons, to riſe againſt, reſiſt, throw down King and all Magiſtrates, Supreme and Subordinate, and in their Phineas-like motions, to uſe the vindicative, puniſhing, reforming Power of the Sword, eſpecially in caſe of defection in matter of Religion; (ſuch as he thinks the cauſe now to be.) And the great ſtreſſe of the buſineſs, is ſtill laid upon theſe Covenants, tacite and virtual, or expreſſe; and, it is pleaded, the people or any part of the people, have by that Covenant, a joynt obligation with the King and all Magiſtrates, lying upon them, to uſe a vindicative and reforming Power, in caſe of defection in Religion; yea, even againſt all back-ſlidden Rulers and the plurality of an apoſtate Nation.

There is a two-fold Covenant they talk of, as the foundation of all humane Societies, 1. the religious joynt Covenant between the King or Soveraign and people with God. 2. The civil Covenant betwixt the King and the people. Concerning the former, it is *Naph.* mind, p. 18. *That albeit the care of Religion toward God, in a vindicative and puniſhing way, and reforming it,* &c. *lyeth upon the King or Magiſtrates mainly,* (he ſhould have ſaid *onely*, for none can produce a commiſſion, but the Powers ordained of God, for uſing the vindicative, punitive and reforming Sword, about which the queſtion is now but only the Magiſtrate) *Yet, there is a joynt obligation lying upon the people, and every party thereof, to vindicate and reform Religion, in a publick punitive way, even againſt all Magiſtrates and Nobles, (if they be the principal perverters and patrons of abominations, and againſt the plurality of the people; for,* ſayes he, 18. p. *Idolatry, perjury,* &c. *ought by all meanes* (n. b.) *to be ſuppreſſed, reſtrained and ſeverly puniſhed*: So that if any part of the people, do think the Magiſtrates, (all of them) or the plurality of the people, Patrons of abominations, (as in the preſent caſe he challenges them to be) any private party that think they have power enough, may flee to the vindicative, puniſhing and reforming Sword; and fall upon all Rulers and others, whom they think to be in a defection, and will boldly ſay, that in truth they are ſo.

This is the mans fine Doctrine: he conceals not his own intentions and his parties, upon the account of the Apoſtaſie which they now fanſie, to fall with bloody cruelty on all Magiſtrates and people too, who ſtand in their way: he ſhews his bloody teeth, but God will knock out the teeth of this ſanguinary Faction, as he hath done. Yea, *Naph.*

runs yet higher; for, upon the conceit of ſetting up Government for Truth and Religion and Gods Worſhip, as the main ends, *P.* 16. he aſſerts, *The ceſſation of the obligation to the Government, when there is a perverſion in that great deſign of it, and a returning of people to their primæve liberty* (as he often ſpeaks) *to erect Governments to their mind, and to combine with whom they will,* (as before we heard.)

Concerning theſe things, we ſay, 1. That albeit it be Gods holy will, that in erections of Civil Government, his Truth, ſincere Worſhip and Glory in theſe, ſhould be mainly minded and intended by men, and it is mens duty ſo to do: yet, it is clear, that in many places *de facto* it is not ſo; although men profeſs in the general, aiming at Truth and right Worſhip, yet there are aberrations in the particular. 2. Albeit there be, in the point of Truth and the Worſhip of God, (which *de jure* ſhould be principally cared for in Government) a notable perverſion and ſwerving; that doth not at all invalidate the Authority or Government, nor break the obligation thereunto, although it be injurious to favourers of Truth and right Worſhip: For, God ſo far regards the keeping of humane Societies in tolerable order, that albeit the great duties of advancement of his Truth and Worſhip be not minded by Rulers; yet, he will not have the Common-wealths, where juſtice between man and man is maintained for his Glory, (although Religion not minded as it ought to be) caſten looſe; nor will have men think themſelves looſed from obligation to the Government, albeit there be perverſion in the managing thereof, as to Religion: for, neither muſt they be heard, who hold, That civil Dominion is grounded on Grace; nor they who ſay, That infidel, heretical or excommunicate Magiſtrates fall from their power, or that the Subjects obligation to them ceaſeth. 3. It ſhall be eaſily granted, that the people, and every one of the people, ought to reform themſelves from all real corruptions in the Worſhip of God, and keep themſelves pure from abominable things, every one is bound to amend one, and ſo all will be more eaſily amended: yea, no man ſhould ſay, *Am I my Brothers keeper*, but by faithful inſtruction, warning, reproof, ſtrive to ſave others from the evils of the times and places wherein they live. But, 4. That there lyes upon the people, with the Magiſtrate, a joynt obligation of publick reforming, and uſing the avenging or punitive Sword in amending things amiſs againſt the will of all Magiſtrates, or even turning that Sword in a violent way againſt him; or that ſuch obligation lyes upon one part of the people, againſt all Magiſtrates and their fellow Subjects, as to violent them in matters of Religion (or which they account

account Religion) it is utterly denyed, acting in a publick co-active way, or by the use of the vindicative and punitive Sword. For, Reformation in a co-active way is so fully and only the Magistrates duty, that whoever will intrude into it (being persons of meer private capacity) they stain Religion, and brings scandal on it by their Rebellion. Though the result of the work be good, the manner is evil; God needs no mans sin to help him in his work; nor will he ever impute it as sin to private persons, that they did tolerate (with grief) what they could not amend, nor that they did forbear violent forcing the Magistrate to their mind (supposing them in the right.) If in a way God hath set me in, I cannot without manifest schisme and sedition, and leaping beyond the limits of my calling, do a good work, I am to leave it to God to do it in his own cleanly way; it is well if I keep my self pure, mourning for abominations done, and praying to God against them, and using all charitable and fraternal means becoming a private Christian; and thus my tolerating of what I cannot amend, shall not be my sin, albeit it is sin in them who have a publick Power, and do not reform, but connive at abuses. As no part of a people or private persons, have power to usurp the Office of a Minister, to preach, minister Sacraments, &c. So, no private persons can lawfully, under whatsoever pretence of good intentions, meddle with the Magistrates work, or intrude in the publick actings only competent to his place who is the Minister of God, invested with Authority by him. Far less can they, in case of his deficiency or opposition, use the vindicative or punishing Sword against him, for not being of their Religion (supposing t to be true) nor against their fellow-subjects: but all this is according to this mans mind.

The great mistake in all this matter, is, that the Magistrate and People are, as to Covenant with God, or engagements to him for advancing his Truth, looked upon as two debitors bound in a Band, conjunctly and severally, for one sum; so that in the deficiency of the one, the other must pay all, and hath power to streese the deficient: So they think, there is a joynt and equal obligation betwixt Princes and People, as touching the publick promoting of Religion. If the Magistrate be deficient, they must do it, yea and fall on him for his deficiency. But there is no such joynt obligation: it is true, the Magistrate in his place is bound in a publick way to advance Religion; the people are also bound in their private capacities and callings, to advance Religion, and to serve the Magistrate therein, as he employes and calls them. But there is no such joynt obligation of King and People unto God, that either

either of them ſhould be ſo bound for the other, that if the one be deficient, the other party contracting becomes therefore obliged to the duty to which the deficient party is obliged, or becomes guilty, if he intrude not in the part of their duty. Nor is there a mutual tye on both to force one another to their duty. *Qui diverſimode obligantur ad diverſa non ſunt correi in promittendo.* The caſe betwixt the King and People in the religious Covenant with God, is like the caſe of two men binding in one band for their ſeveral moieties of a ſum; if the one be deficient, the other is not ſtreſſed for it, nor is the payer bound to force the deficient by vertue of the band. If the People reform themſelves, and keep themſelves pure from abominations, the Magiſtrates deficiency (which they tolerate with grief) ſhall not be imputed to them, becauſe God gives them not a calling to intrude into the Magiſtrates office, or to uſe the reforming Sword, or vindicative and puniing acts of it (which only are committed to the Magiſtrate.) The King indeed is bound, both as a Chriſtian, to own Religion for his own ſouls good, and as a King, to uſe his magiſtratical Power to force his Subjects to the uſe of external means of Religion (which is all he can do) and if he do this, and meet with the inſuperable ſtubborneſſe of an evil people, the guiltineſſe lyes not on him, but on them. But upon the people, there lyes no obligation to force the King, or their fellow ſubjects to external means of Worſhip and Religion, becauſe that is not within the verge of their calling, only they are to keep themſelves pure, and to uſe all moral means uſable by perſons in their ſtation, to move others to embrace true Religion. And having done this, they diſcharge themſelves ſufficiently, and may commit the reſt to God. The late Covenant it ſelf doth only bind *private perſons in their places and callings* (which certainly are private, and to be managed by private means) to endeavour reformation, and doth not bind any number of meer private perſons, to pull the Sword out of the Magiſtrates hands, when they think he uſeth it otherwiſe then he ſhould, and then they would have him uſe it. It is not, can never be the place and calling of meer private perſons, and the minor or far minor part of the People, to uſe the vindicative, puniſhing and reforming Sword againſt all Magiſtrates (reckoned by them as Apoſtates) and againſt all the body of the Land. If the Covenant be paſſive of ſuch Commentaries as this man puts upon it, that whatever any private party accounts Reformation, they may uſe the vindictive puniſhing Sword againſt all of all degrees that ſtand in their way to advance the ſame, we have little reaſon to be in love with it; and juſt cauſe to caſt it by, till it be cleared of ſuch corrupt gloſſes.

Bur,

But, let us now consider the civil Covenant betwixt the King and the People, *Naph.* touches on it on the forecited places, and the Author of *L. R.* puts forth his strength (such as it is) upon this matter, avowing, *that the King is not King, but Covenant-wise and conditionally, and that by Covenant; the people have a civil claim against him, may punish him, and have a right to a coactive power over him in Courts set up by themselves. And may as they see fit, resume what power he hath, for he is but their Servant and Vassal* (as he saith.) What can Protestant Princes expect, but destructive doctrine from this hand and pen, that hath written up, (Page 178.) *John Marian* the *Jesuite, lib.* 1. *de Rege*, for one of his approved Authors (as he calls them) a reprobate Author, (amongst all good men) is the man, and his book commending regicide by any means, is infamous in all Christendom; however this man count of him as an approved Author: and his spirit may be no lesse seen, in that, while he approves this man, he hath set this mark on famous Bishop *Andrews*, known in his time to be most adverse to Papists, P. 423. Bishop *Andrews* (saith he) *his name is a curse on the earth, his writings prove him to be a popish Apostate.* What of his writings this man hath seen, who can tell? but all that the world hath seen of his writings, prove him a great Antipopist and found Protestant. But to our purpose: This civil Covenant 'twixt King and People, is pleaded as that which is essential and fundamental to the constitution of all politick Societies; and whereupon, peoples both resisting the Prince, and revenging themselves upon him, is mainly grounded. Yea, *Naph.* will have it to be a sufficient ground, not only for the Proceres or Body of the people, to proceed vindicatively against the King, but (in application to the Rebellion, he intends to justifie) for any private persons whatsoever, if they be in probable capacity to do mischief, without drawing mischief upon themselves; and so out-stripes his master, (who gives not much to any private persons upon this account, but to the States of the Land and inferior Magistrates with the Body of the people.)

But as to the Covenant betwixt King and People, both *L. R.* and *Naph.* urge it as the ground for not only resisting, but punishing Kings and all Magistrates, (when they account them Tyrants.) and will have a tacite virtual Covenant as valid for their ends, as where it is expres; avowing it to be essentially fundamental in the constitution of all political Societies. This brings to mind the folly of the man, that would have all to be tyed in a Band that he had made, aswell these who subscribed not, as these who subscribed it. But to be serious, as to this matter;

ter; we ſay, 1. it is eaſily conceded, that there is a mutual obligation betwixt Magiſtrates and Subjects to mutual duties, which is indeed eſſential to the conſtitution of the politick Body; but this obligation ariſes not from any tacite or expreſs Covenant betwixt them, but from the Ordinance and Will of God, enjoining them theſe duties in ſuch relations, in that Society wherein they are combined. 2. That obligation, though it be mutual in the relations they are in; yet, it is not conditional: there is a mutual obligation to mutual duties betwixt Parents and Children, but it is not conditional; nor is there ſuch a Contract or Covenant, that if Parents be undutiful, Children ſhould be looſed from their duty, or upon the contrary: but Children are bound to be ſubject to their Parents, without any condition or paction on their part, (only in point of obedience active, Gods will is to be preferred to theirs, and nothing is to be done contrary to Gods Will for their pleaſure) otherwiſe the ſubjection is not conditional, but abſolute. So alſo, peoples obedience to Kings (properly and truly ſo called) is not conditional, (*ſi meruerint*) nor is the duty of the King to them conditional, (*ſi meruerint*) but each of them is abſolutely bound to do duty in their own relations, wherein they are one to another, the obligation is abſolute, (*ſalva Deo obedientia.*) Reverend Mr. *Calvin* ſpeaks home to this purpoſe, *lib.* 4. *inſt. cap.* 20. S. 29. preventing an objection againſt obeying wicked and tyrrannous Magiſtrates; *At mutuas (inquies) ſubditis ſuis vices debent præfecti. Id jam confeſſus ſum, verum ſi ex eo ſtatuis non niſi juſtis imperiis rependenda eſſe obſequia, inſulſus es rationator; nam & Viri Uxoribus & Liberi Parentibus mutuis officiis aſtringuntur*, &c. He ſayes, that albeit Parents *diſcedant ab officio*, &c. depart from their duty, and exceedingly provoke their Children to wrath, and Husbands uſe their Wives reproachfully, whom they ought to entertain kindly; yet, *improbis & inofficioſis ſubjiciuntur Uxores & Liberi.* And he adds there gravely, *that inferiors ſhould not ſo much inquire into the duties of their ſuperiors, as every one ſhould ſearch what is their own duty*; and no think themſelves diſoblieged from their duty, becauſe the other bound to do duty to them, is therein deficient: this is Chriſtian divinity indeed. As the Magiſtrate is not to think the performance of his duty is dependent upon the condition of the Subjects doing their duty; So, neither are the Subjects of a lawful King, to account themſelves bound only conditionally to him, if he do his duty. 3. The fancy of a tacite, virtual, natural Covenant, betwixt King and People, (as they uſe to call it) equivalent to all ends that an explicite and expreſs Covenant can have;

over-

overthrows the distinction that all sound Protestant Divines and Politicians make, betwixt *a limited or pactional Prince*, and *an absolute Prince*, or one who is *integra Majestatis*, who takes not his Kingdom upon conditions prescribed to him, so as in case of failing he be subject to their censure or punishment; *Est alius principatus absolutus*, saith *Rivet. Pf.* 68. p. 420. *Est etiam alius sub conditione pacti conventi temperatus*, to that same purpose *Gerhard, de Magistrat.* p. 935. wherein they agree with *Calvin, lib. 4. inst. cap.* 20. *art.* 31. But now, this man is bold to say, *There is no absolute King, that such a King is contrary to the Word of God*, (*L. R.* p. 107.) and herein he (deserting our Protestant Divines) sides with *Bellarm. recognit. lib. de laicis*, where he saith, *Inter principem & subditos est reciproca obligatio, si non expressa tamen tacita, ut Magistratus potest subditos ad obedientiam vi illius obligationis cogere, ita subditi possunt à Magistratu deficere, si capita illius fœderis transgrediatur.* Whereupon and the like speeches, *Gerhard* in the foresaid place speaking, asserts, *Totam horum & similium argumentorum structuram uno impetu dejicit Apostolus; Omnis anima*, Rom. 13. *&c.* and sayes, that *Barclay, Cunerus, Albericus, Gentilis, Arminians, solide refutarunt*, have refuted solidly the arguments of the Antimonarchists, as they have done indeed. But, as to an absolute Prince, albeit this Statist sayes, he is contrary to the word of God, it is most untrue. For, as our Laws (which this man cares not to contradict) allows our Kings to be absolute in express termes, *Jam.* 1. *Par.* 18. *an.* 1606. *Act.* 2. So the Scripture is not against an absolute Prince, as our Laws and we understand him, (*qui non (umit ant ponit secures, arbitrio popularis aurœ*) no King is so absolute to rule as he lists, (we abhor *quicquid libet licet*) he is subordinate unto God and his Will; and he ought also to walk according to the particular good Laws he hath made with consent of his people; *Digna vox est Majestate regnantis se alligatum legibus principem fateri*; and we doubt not our King doth, and will do so: but he is so absolute, that if he deviate (which God avert) he is not under co-active power of Subjects, that they should have Law-claim against him, and in their Courts of Nature and Necessity (as this man loves to speak) pronounce judgement upon him to destroy him. A Crown was never given him, never accepted by him, on such horrid termes: far less, that by virtue of this supposed tacite Covenant, any minor meer private party of the people might, without and against the great body, have liberty to pull, not only the King, but all Magistrates out of their seat, punishing them, and

possessing

poſſeſſing themſelves in their rooms, which is the expreſſe doctrine of *Naph.* out-ſtripping his Maſter, *Sequiturq; patrem non paſſibus æquis.* 4. There are ſeveral wayes of conveighances of Kingdoms: Where there is freedom of election of the particular perſon to reign, there may poſſibly be expreſſe limiting conditions, allowing a reſerve of Power to ſome not meer ſubjects, to coerce and reduce in order diviating Soveraigny: As in the Empire of *Germany* and Kingdom of *Poland*, (or if there be any like) whoſe Kings are not, *veri nominis Reges*, but perſonated Kings and Monarchs, (as a painted man is not a man) there is ſome likeneſs to a Kingſhip and Monarchy, and ſome power over others, given for executing the Laws: But the Supreme Majeſty, doth not wholly reſide in theſe, more then in the mock Kings of *Sparta*, when they were under the tutory of the *Ephori*: But in the conveighances of many Kingdoms, and all (properly called Monarchies) there is neither tacit nor expreſſed Covenants, impowering others to be Judges over the King, which is the deſign theſe Covenants are pleaded for; how many Kingdoms are, and have been attained to by conqueſt in a juſt War? (which is a ſufficient title, and no the right of robbers, as ſome call it) albeit there be direct oppoſition, ſo long as there is power, and a tacit diſſent, (when their power is gone) yet, the conqueſt coming by a lawful and well grounded War; the dominion and the authority, even over the unwilling and repining ſubjects is lawful, though it may be made ſurer, by their after conſent to ſubmit. And if this purchaſed power be hereditarily tranſmitted, the ſucceſſors receives power from their Parents, not from the people; nor is there any ſhaddow of tacit or expreſs Covenant in this matter; *if ye Rule well, we ſhall obey you; otherwiſe, not.* 5. If we look to our own Kingdom of *Scotland* from the beginning, there will be found no ſuch Covenant, on which the conſtitution of the ſame is founded: There are four or five remarkable inſtances concerning this Kingdom, to clear the matter. 1. Look to the foundation thereof in *Fergus* the firſt, 330. yeares before Chriſts birth; *Buchannan* himſelf cannot ſay, that he is admitted King upon conditions: the ſubjects indeed by their oath, confirmed the Kingdom to him and his poſterity; but no oath was required of him, nor of any of his ſucceſſors, till King *James* the ſixth his time, (of which we ſhall anon hear.) Of this *Fergus*, the black Book of *Paſley* (as I have heard from credible Reporters) ſaith, *Fergus fuit ſe Regem fecit.* 2. *Fergus* the ſecond, the 40. King, the great reſterer of our Nation, who began to Reign, *Anno Chr.* 404. did by his valour, (under the conduct of divine Providence, and by the help

of

of Strangers, *Danes* and others, with some small remainder of Scots, recover the Kingdom, after that the whole Nation was banished, and no Scots-man might abide in *Scotland* under pain of death; he was not beholden to the people for the Kingdom, nor had it by paction with them. 3. *Kenneth* the first, the 50. King, *Anno Chr.* 605. who destroyed the Picts, and enlarged his Kingdom, by the accession of theirs, purchasing more and better Lands then he had before, which he distributed to his subjects; he held not this purchased Kingdom of them, by contract or paction to be subject to them, on whom, he bestowed the Lands thereof. The 4. is *Robert Bruce*, the 97. King, *Anno Chr.* 1036. Whom our Lawes of *Regiam Majestatem*, &c. calls, *Conquestor magnus*: he re-conquered the Kingdom, when it was almost wholly alienated and subdued by the English, and but little reserved. The English held it for many years: And the Nobility of *Scotland* first at *Barwick*, then at *St. Andrews*, in plain Parliament, swore homage and obedience to the King of *England*; Yet, that Prince having a prosperous gale of divine Providence assisting his Valour, recovered the Nation out of bondage: And who will assert, there were pactions between him and the people, to bring him under their coactive judicial Power? A fifth instance there is, right memorable in our own times; It is known, our Nation was totally subdued by the English, and continued so, for the space of ten years: The representatives of Shires and Cities and Towns, combined into a Common-wealth-government, and sent their Commissioners to the meeting thereof at *London*, where the Kings interest was disclaimed; yet in a wonderful way, God brought him in again, and finding us at his coming a fully conquered and subdued Nation, restored us to our freedom from the bondage of Forraigners. If any will say, that it was upon his account, the Nation was brought to the suffering of that bondage, and that there did ly bands upon him as our sworn King, to free us when he should be in capacity to do it; It may be answered, 1. It is known, that when the fatal stroke that sunk us into bondage was given, there was an expres disowning of his right, by publick Judicatories of the Land, in the quarrel with the English Sectaries before *Dunbar*. 2. Whatever engagements were upon him for the good of the Nation; Yet, if these mens principles were to be followed, they could had no force on him, to move him to labour our vindication into liberty; for, do not they teach, that in the mutual Contract and Covenant betwixt King and People, the People are loosed from their duty, if the King fail in his, *frangenti fidem, fides*

frangatur eidem; And why then is not the King looſed, if the people fail on their part? It is known, that (although the Nobles, and Body of the People were well enough affected to the King, and cordially loved him, when they were overpowered and could do nothing) yet by their repreſentatives he was diſowned (which in Law would be reckoned their own deed.) And if a ſworn people, deſert and diſclaim their King by their repreſentatives, may not the King alſo have the benefite of the conditional Covenant, and leave them as he found them, in bondage to forreigners. But ſuch was his Majeſties Graciouſneſs and Wiſdom, as well as Conſcience of duty, that although the Nation had failed much to him, he would not walk after the counſels of theſe men. And we may, (all things conſider'd) aſſert, that the people of *Scotland* do rather owe their liberty to him, then he doth owe his Authority to them, or by vertue of any Covenant with them.

But not to dwell too much on this, as to any expreſſe Covenant enſtating the People, or any part thereof in a coactive judicial Power over our Princes, to puniſh them in caſe of aberrations in Government; from the foundation of our Kingdom of *Scotland*, there is no ſuch thing to be found: *Buchannan* himſelf can never ſhow, that before King *James* the ſixth his time, any of our Kings at their inſtalling did ſwear to, or covenant with the people, (albeit the people have ſworn homage to them) none of them all before that time did ſwear covenant-wiſe at their reception of the Crown, nor can it be evidenced, that Loyalty was engaged to the King, *if they thought he ruled well and no otherwiſe*. Some of our Hiſtorians cited by *Blackwood*, make mention of one of our Kings, *Gregory the Great*, who did reign *Anno Chr.* 876. who when he was crown'd, did (in his piety) ſwear to defend the liberties of Chriſtian Religion, of the Church, of all the Prieſts and Miniſters of Religion; and ordained, that all his Succeſſors, Kings of *Scotland*, ſhould ſwear that oath at their entry to the Government. Yet this is not mentioned by *Buchannan*, leaſt perhaps our Kings might think, obligations do lye on them by that Law, to maintain Popery, far advanced in *Gregories* time. But no other oath is mentioned, till *James* the ſixth his time; when he was in the craddle, his Regent *Murray* fram'd an oath to be ſworn by him, and his Succeſſors, recorded Parliament 1. King *James* the 6. but that oath never any did ſwear for him, (albeit at his Coronation in the moneth of *July*, before that Act, which was not made till the 15. of *Decemb.* after, *Anno* 1567. the Earles of *Mortoun* and *Hume*, did promiſe ſome ſuch thing for the King, as *Buchannan* ſayes) nor did he himſelf ever

ſwear

ſwear it, when he came to be Major and from under the Tutory of Regents. When he entred actually to reign, and accepted the Regiment in his own perſon, *Anno* 1577. being of the age of twelve years, no man durſt ever offer that oath to him, nor when he came to be of full and perfect age. Not, but that it is in it ſelf (and rightly underſtood) a good and godly oath, but in regard of the evil Principles, with which ſome Subjects were in that time poiſoned, as if ſuch an Oath and Covenant gave a coactive right and power to Subjects over their Prince, in all their apprehenſions of his failing (as now we are taught by men of the ſeditious ſtamp) it was thought fit to wave the putting ſuch an oath unto him at his entry to the actual Government (he not having taken it before) that the fancy of ſuch a coactive Covenant, which might breed evil humours in the Subjects, might be removed. Whither King *Charles* the firſt did ſwear that ſame oath, recorded in the firſt Parliament of King *James* the ſixth, we cannot certainly ſay (there is nothing left upon publick record of that matter at his Coronation) but if he did ſo, he was the firſt King of this Nation, that received the Crown in way of Covenant with the people, or ſwearing to them yet had he reigned eight years over us before that time; and no man durſt, or in reaſon could ſay, as now is printed, that he was no King till he took the Coronation oath. How this came to paſſe we know not, but it is to be believed on good ground, could that King once have thought, that his taking of that oath (although it be in it ſelf godly and good) ſhould have been ſo far miſtaken by his Subjects, as that he ſhould have been thought thereby to have ſubmitted himſelf to their coactive and punitive power in every caſe, wherein they, or any party of them (being meer private perſons) might think him deficient, he would rather have endured any death, then ſo to caſt himſelf away, at the pleaſure of malecontented parties amongſt the people, taking advantage againſt him by that oath. But it ſhall be avowed, that that King of glorious memory, did never ſhrink from the obſervance of that godly oath, whatever the malice of his clamorous and embitter'd enemies repreſents to the contrary. Neither hath his Majeſty that now reigneth, ſwerved from the obſervation of that oath hitherto, and we are hopeful, Gods grace ſhall preſerve him hereafter from any ſuch thing.

But the matter concerning this civil Covenant, is not yet at an end; for, the Author of *L. R.* bends his wit to wreſt the holy Scriptures to make this Covenant neceſſary, (yea, for ſuch ends as he deſigns, *viz. the coaction and puniſhing of the Prince*) and backs his wreſted Scriptures with ſome ſophiſtical reaſonings. Did we indeed find ſuffi-

cient

cient ground for such a Covenant, or for such ends in holy Scriptures, we should strike sail, and no wait for ragged reasonings to cast dust in our eyes. But when we look to Gods directions, about setting up of Kings amongst his people, and upon the doing of the thing suitably to these directions: We professe in sincerity, that we find nothing, but that it was Gods mind, that both King and People should do their mutual duties (the one to the other) but that there is any such Covenant impowering people to use force upon the King, to throw him down, punish or destroy him, when they or any particular party of meer private persons apprehend the ends of Government to be perverted. There is no mention of any such Covenant, *Deut.* 17. where the manner of setting a King over them is prescribed; there is no such thing done, when *Samuel* by Gods appointment, anoints and sets a King over the people: nor is there any such thing found at the entry of any of the Kings of Gods people to their Government: only there are two instances (upon special and extraordinary occasions) of such Covenants betwixt the King and People, the import of neither of which, is to state the people in coactive judicial Power over these Kings, and which cannot by any Logick be drawn to be Patterns of necessary doing such a thing in all Kingdoms.

The first instance is of *David*, 2 *Sam.* 5. 3. 1 *Chr.* 11. 3. where (though he had reigned seven years and a half in *Hebron*, over the men of *Judah*, without any such Covenant, 2 *Sam.* 2. 4.) *Israel* and the rest of the Tribes, having all that time resisted *David* and cleaved to *Ishboshetb*, *Saul's* Son, as their King, 2 *Sam.* 2. 10. The King being killed, and *Abner* the General, they come to a submission to *David*; and he being willing to entertain them, enters in covenant with them, in a piece of holy policy meet for that time, to gather together the scattered people of God, who might be tempted otherwise to other courses; they were now coming to be his Subjects, who were not so before, but were under another King; and fit it was to give them security, touching his good mind toward them, they having so long stood it out in arms against him. But the question is, what was the nature, the matter and import of that Covenant: The Scripture sayes not, it was such a Covenant, (as these men would have) *I shall rule you rightly, if you obey me dutifully, otherwise not, (upon the Kings part) And upon the peoples part, We shall obey you and be subject to you, if ye rule us rightly; otherwise, We will not, but use our co-active power upon you, to dethrone and destroy you and punish you.* That there was any such conditional Covenant expressed or meant, is far from the truth:

David

David neither minds to admit them to be his Subjects conditionally, or to subject himself to their co-active power; nor minde they to offer themselves to be his Subjects in such terms. On the contrary it appeareth clearly in the Text, that they recognosce his right of reigning over them is from God, and that he was not subject to be removed by them; see 2 *Sam.* 5. 2. 1 *Chr.* 11. 2, 3. They say, *The Lord said to thee, thou shalt feed my people* Israel, *and shalt be Captain or Ruler over them.* And it is added, *Therefore they came*, &c. *and anointed him King over* Israel, *according to the Word of the Lord by* Samuel. They humbly declare him King whom God had constituted, whom they could not lawfully reject: and it is impious to think, that they recognoscing Gods constitution of him, yet should fancy a Paction or Covenant, giving them co-active superiority over him, to remove him when they thought meet, though God had set him on the Throne by a special appointment. All the Covenant that can be supposed here, is upon the peoples part, an engagement to humble subjection and homage: And upon the Kings part, a Covenant of indempnity for former oppositions to him (wherein they had need to be comfortably secured) or at most, we shall not repugne, if it be called a Covenant both of protection and right ruling of them; yet so, as not subjecting himself to their censures or co-action, or that they should be his Subjects only upon that condition, being otherwise free to fall upon him. The Covenant may be to mutual duties, and yet on neither side conditional, but absolute; each party obliging themselves to their own duty absolutely, but not on condition that the other party do their duty. As if a man bind himself by oath to give me one hundred pounds; and I bind my self again by oath to him, to give him one hundred pounds, without conditional provision that he pay me the money he promised me: Albeit he should fail in his oath and not pay me, yet must not I fail in mine, but must pay him; because my oath is separate from his, and independent upon it, and hath a separate obligation absolute, which no failing of the other party to me can loose. Indeed the case is otherwise, when there is a reciprocal contract of things to be done by one party, upon condition of some things to be done by the other, (as in Covenants of Peace between Nations) there the breach of condition by one party, looses the promise of the other, which was only conditionally made. But, subjection is not engaged to Kings conditionally, but absolutely, albeit obedience to God be reserved, when any active obedience contrary to him is called for.

Again, for the other instance of the Covenant, which *Joboiadah*, made

made between King *Joash* and the people, 2 *Chr.* 13. 2, 3. 2 *Kings* 11. 17. this was also made upon an extraordinary occasion, (for ordinarily, we never hear of any such Covenants amongst Gods people and their Kings; and extraordinaries cannot Found ordinary Rules.) *Athaliah* had murthered all the royal Seed, 2 *King.* 11. 2 *Chr.* 23. except *Joash*, who was kept secret six years in the house of the Lord, while the usurper possessed the Kingdom: Now when the godly Priest *Jehoiadah*, the Kings Tutor, saw a fit time, he ingaged the principal men in Covenant of fidelity to the King, 2 *King.* 11. 4. and shewed them the Kings Son; This was a necessary piece of holy Policy, when the Usurper and her faction, had so long strengthned themselves, to engage the chief men to special fidelity to him. *And* after that, 12. 17. *He brought forth the Kings Son, and put the Crown upon him, and gave him the Testimony, and they made him King and anointed him, and they clapt their hands and said, God save the King*; *and* Jehoiadah, *made a Covenant betwixt the Lord and the King and the people, and that they should be the Lords people, between the King also and the people. Joash* was then but seven years old, and not in capacity to make a Covenant with the people; but, his godly Tutor did preside in that business: But two things to our purpose are remarkable; 1. That he is Crowned and made King before the Covenant is made, (as is clear in the Text) which crosses our Antimonarchists, who assert, the King cannot be made King, untill he make the Covenant with the people, and that he gets the Crown and royal Authority, Covenant-wise and conditionally; whereas, here he is made King antecedently to any Covenant, as the Text clears it. 2. That albeit the matter of King and peoples Covenant with God be expressed, *viz. That they should be the Lords people*; yet, it is not told us, what the tenor of the Covenant betwixt King and people was, nor what the King or *Jehoiadah* Covenanted in his name, the young King of seven years old, what could he say in Covenanting? *Jehoiadah* was only President in the matter. *Diodat* seems to say well, that in this place, Jehoiadah *made the people swear alledgiance and fidelity to the King*, (*as before he had made the Rulers do*, vers. 4.) and no more, *he took an oath of fidelity of them*: But, how shall it be cleared, that it was conditional, and with a reserve of coactive and punitive Power over him? (as these men will have it.) But passing from this, let it be so, (which cannot be asserted with warrand) that all the Kings of *Judah*, made such conditional Covenants with the people, (as is supposed) yet, will any judicious man

force

force the particular customes of that Nation on all Nations, that might be best for that Nation that was not simply best, their customs without a Law of God bearing a standing reason, cannot be obligatory on others, least we judaize too much. But the constant practice of all the Prophets and people of God in that Kingdom, when their Kings were very wicked, idolatrous and tyrannous, speaks clearly, that they never had such thoughts of a liberty by vertue of covenant, to fall with violence on their Kings: The Prophets of God, never taught them insurrections against Kings, (as false Prophets do now) albeit they had as great cause as ever people had (under some of their Kings) and were in capacity probable enough to crush them, they never suggested to them that their obligations to subjection unto their Kings, being but conditional, they were set free, when they became so extreamly wicked, idolatrous, &c. nor did ever Godly people, (although they strived to keep themselves pure, and to gain-stand in their private capacities the evils of the times) think themselves free, to use violence against Powers above them; had this been their duty, no doubt Gods Prophets would plainly and down-right have told them of it, without circumlocutions, but this they never did; either that was no duty, or the Prophets were not faithful in not admonishing them of their duty: When at first, that people sought a King from *Samuel*, they resolved not to take him conditionally, *si bene regnaverit*, but with all the faults that might follow him; neither reserved they Power to coerce him, (which had it been in their thoughts, would easily have answered and weakned *Samuels* terrifying dissuasive; for they could have said, we take him only as King, on condition of his good behaviour; otherwise, we will take order with him) but would have one, as other Nations had Kings about them, (of whom *Buchanan* says, they were not *legitimi Reges*, but *tyranni* in his language, because not under Law coaction) And so also, they behaved themselves toward them, not using them as they deserved; but forbearing violence against them, although they were very evil Princes many of them.

But yet further it is pressed, that such an Oath and Covenant betwixt King and People was in use then, because, *Eccles.* 8. 2. *It is said I counsel thee to keep the Kings commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God.* Therefore, there was (say they) an Oath or Covenant betwixt King and People. *Ans.* 1. The most that can be made of this place, is (as *Diodat* in his note thereupon affirms) *that the subjects swore the oath of Allegiance and Obedience to the King*, upon the ground whereof, they were to obey him; it was at most *fœdus*

 unila-

unilaterum (as they call it in the Schools) but it imports not mutual engagement of the King to them, or that he swore to them, much less that the Oath they made to him was conditional, with a reserve of Power to punish him for his deviations (which in this same King that writes this were very great) albeit we grant all such oaths to Kings to be understood, *salvo jure Dei, & salva Deo obedientia.* 2. We do not see ground to assert, that ordinarily amongst that people, there were oaths of fidelity and obedience given to their Kings (whatever was done in the extraordinary cases above mentioned) far lesse, that Kings engaged to them by oath ordinarily; both the King ruled without such an oath, and the people obeyed without such an oath or engagement. Neither is there in *Deut.* 17. or 1 *Sam.* 8. or any where else, such a rule set in the institution or constitution of the King, that any such matter should be done. Nor hear we in the History of this same King *Solomon*, who writes this, that when he entred to the Throne, either he swore to the people, or they to him, unlesse perhaps, 2 *Sam.* 23. 24. may import this as to *Solomon.* *Junius* translation of this Text (wherein he is followed by *Cartwright*) may well passe, *præstitutum Regis observa, sed pro ratione juramenti Dei*, i. e. Keep the Kings Commandment so far as it may be keeped, retaining fidelity to God, to whom absolute and illimited obedience is sworn; So not the motive of obedience to the King (because of the oath sworn to him) is here imported, but only the measure and moderation of our obedience due to him, so as it may consist with the duty sworn to God: our obedience to the King is here cautionated (saith *Cartwright*) *dummodo non pugnet cum juramento quo divino imperio obstricti sumus*, we are to obey him. 3. We may hold close to our own translation, and yet not be necessitate to grant, so much to be spoken of here as an oath of the people to the King; let be a mutual Oath and Covenant betwixt King and People, (neither of which was in ordinary use amongst that people, nor mentioned in sacred Scripture as ordinary. For, they were all bound by oath to obey all Gods Commandments (this was the oath of God) and amongst his Commandments, this was one, that they should obey the King in the Lord, and obey all the Kings lawful Commandments, in regard of their general oath and engagement to God, to obey all his commandments: they were bound to obey the Kings Command under God, and in subordination to him, albeit they never took any particular oath to obey the King, and dealt not covenant-wise with him. And thus the sense runs fairly, *I counsell thee to keep the Kings commandment, and that in regard of*, (or, propter) *the oath of God*: because

because thou hast sworn to obey God; obey the King in all lawful things, for this is the will of God. The motive of obedience is taken not from any particular oath made to the King, but from the general oath made to God, engaging in all things to obey him.

But yet this business of the civil Covenant is not at an end; for, it is urged (*L. R.* P. 97.) *that this Covenant tyes the King* (be it tacite or expresse) *not to God only, but to the people, and brings him by reciprocation of bands, to be under a Law-obligation; to be subject to the peoples censure and punishment in case of failing, as well as they are subject to to him in case of failing; and that all covenants and contracts betwixt man and man, bring the covenanters under a law and claim before men, if the contract be broken. And that the King becoming bound to the people, he comes under action and claim by them if he fail, and is punishable as they are, if they fail. And that the King and they, have a mutual coactive power one over another, and are mutually Magistrates one to another; and the people, if the King fail, may judge him in their tribunal of necessity; and that there needs no judge on earth between them, more then between two Nations independent one upon another, when they warr together. And that in reformations of things amisse, (especially in Religion) people may extraordinarily intrude in the Magistrates office, and not only reform themselves* actibus elicitis, *but reform others* actibus imperatis. *And that people, by vertue of this supposed covenant, may (when they see cause) formally and effectively exercise upon their Kings that royalty which they have in themselves virtually and fountally.* Much of that sort of stuffe is to be found, *quest.* 14. 40. and every where in that Book. And it is lamentable, that while they who labour to preserve Gods order in the world, should be branded as flatterers and Parasits of Princes, such flatterers of People to their own confusion and destruction, should (with their writings) have such entertainment and countenance. But yet it must be said, that *L. R.* is far more tolerable then *Naph.* for, what he grants only to the body of the people or the inferior Rulers and Nobles with the people, in acting against the King, *Naph.* extends in favours of any party of meer private persons amongst the people against all Magistrates, supreme and subordinate; and affirms, what the whole body with inferior Magistrates may do against a King (deviating from his duty) any small part of meer private persons (if they have strength enough) may by vertue of the Covenant, do the same against all Magistrates supreme and subordinate, not only as to resistance, but as to revenge and punishing them.

A few notes shall be sufficient upon the former Doctrine, and then the matter shall be at an end. 1. Where a Covenant is made between a King and a People, (a King I say, that is truly such a one) its granted that the Covenant on the Kings part binds him not only to God, in relation to the people, as the object of his duty, but doth bind him to the people formally, yet not so as if he be deficient in his duties, they are enstated in a power above him, to sit as his Judges, or that they are loosed from all duty to him, and free to do him violence. If a Father swear to do his fatherly duty to his Child, that makes not the Child his Superior to punish him if he fail; when a Minister is admitted to teach a people, he swears to them to be dutiful, but they are not therefore made his Superiors to punish him if he fail. It is a most false assertion that goes alongs that whole Book, *that a right is given (by the covenant sworn) to the inferiors and subjects in the politick Society, to judge and punish their superiors in case of failing.* No man can lawfully be judged and punished (whatever contract be) by another then his lawful Judge that is above him in that Society, whereof he is a part, *L R.* Pag. 100. 101.

2. There is a very great difference between these who are in different political Societies, when they break their Contracts or Covenants one with another; and betwixt the head and body, or members of one and that same civil Society. God having allowed lawful Wars, allows seeking of reparation or repelling of wrongs done by one Nation to another, by force of the Sword, when no rational means can bring the doers of the wrong to do right; and there being no other remedy, he himself, the Lord of hosts and God of armies, sits Judge and Moderator in that great business, and in the use of War is appealed to as Judge, there being no common Judge on earth to sit on the causes of these independent Nations. But God, having set and established in one particular and political Society or Nation, his own Ordinance of Magistracy, to which every soul must be subject, and all subject to the Supreme; he hath not put the punishing Sword in any hand, but in the hand of the Magistrate his Sword-bearer, *Rom.* 13. Nor hath allowed liberty to meer private persons to manage it against the supreme Magistrate, no nor to inferior Magistrates (as to him) who in respect of the supreme Majesty, are but private persons, whatever they be toward their inferiors. The Magistrates (chiefly the Supreme) are by their official power above the whole Nation; and as absurd it is to say, they are above the powers which God hath set over them, (as *L. R. p.* 460. saith Thrasonically, *he hath proved unanswerably*) as to

say,

ſay, that every Pariſh is above the Miniſter, in an Eccleſiaſtical way, though he have official power over them all; or that every Lord in *Scotland* have their Tennents and Vaſſals above them, a thing which the Nobles of *Scotland* had need to look to: For certainly, the Principles which lead to ſubject Kings to people, lead clearly, and by undoubted conſequence, to ſubject them to their Vaſſals, and to all under them; yea, and all Maſters to Servants, and Parents to Children, and to confound and invert the order of all humane Societies. This truth we muſt cleave to, that in one and that ſame civil Society where God hath appointed Rulers and ruled, Subjects cannot without ſacrilegious intruſion and contempt of God, ſnatch the Sword out of the Magiſtrates hand to puniſh him with it, (though in ſome particulars he abuſe it) Neither can a War, intended for this end by meer private perſons, be lawful againſt their head or heads; nor can any forraign War be managed, without a lawful Authority on the Part of the undertakers.

3. It is a very falſe aſſertion, *That the people gave the Kingdom to* David *only conditionally*, if he did ſuch and ſuch duties to them; and if not, reſerving power to dethrone him, *L. R. p.* 97. God having ſet *David* upon his holy hill as his King, and not only made him King by his Providence, but expreſs deſignment, ſpecial command and word, none on earth were left at liberty to undo what God would have done and appointed to be.

4. It is very weakly reaſoned, (*L. R. p.* 97.) *That becauſe Gods people may humbly plead with himſelf, upon the account of his own fidelity in promiſing, or* (as this man ſayes) *have action of Law and* jus quoddam (a bold enough expreſſion) *againſt God to plead with him; that therefore the Kings Covenant gives the people ground of civil action againſt him, to coerce or puniſh him.* It had been better ſaid, that upon this ground they might humbly plead with him, ſupplicat and reaſon with him as Gods Deputy, bearing the impreſs of his Majeſty and Soveraignty on earth. But, as God cannot otherwiſe be pleaded with, upon account of his promiſe, (wherein he is bound not ſo much to us, as to his own fidelity to evidence it, *reddit ille debita nulli debens*) and cannot be pleaded with by force or violence: So his Deputies on earth, on whom, under himſelf, he hath ſtamped inviolable Majeſty, whatever they be (as *Calvin* writes, in the place often cited) are not to be pleaded with by ſtrong hand and force (howſoever in ſomethings they miſcarry, a thing not competent to the Majeſty of God) For, he hath not in his Word given any commiſſion to any of

their

their Subjects to rise violently against them, or use the punishing Sword upon them. If this commission can be produced, we have no more to say, but *Good is the Word of the Lord*: but till this be seen, we shall cleave to *Rom.* 13. that makes the Magistrate the only Sword-bearer of God to avenge or punish, however perhaps he hath his aberrations in using it. If this man can shew a Superior on earth to use the Sword upon the Soveraign Magistrate, people shall have fair liberty to plead their claim or law-suit as he calls it before him. But who will judge it more reason, that these who are Plaintifes shall be judges of the Party they complain of, more then the party (or Prince) Judge to them? Is not this a perversion of all judgement that in one and the same body politick, the accuser and Judge shall be coincident in the same persons or person? And they shall use the punishing Sword over all Rulers, to whom God never committed it, *the notions of original, fountaine, virtual royalty in the people, which they may render formal, effectual and actual, when they see fit*, are but high flown unregardable fancies of the masters of confusion. All magistratical Authority is originally and fountally in God alone, whose Minister the Magistrate is (and not the peoples, although for the peoples good) whatever intereſts people may have in instrumental application of the power to such or such persons sometimes; Government is not in the people virtually (though wrongously sometimes they usurp it.) No man hath the Power of the Sword over his own life, nor over the life of his neighbours, (as he is a private man, not invested with magistratical Authority) and so cannot transmit that to another, which he hath not himself. None have this avenging Power of the Sword over mens lives, but the Magistrate alone, whom people by Gods law are bound to choose, if they want one in their Societies and Combinations, but whomever they designe they do not empower him; it is God by his Ordinance that doth this, the Power is from God, not from them, albeit the application of the person to the Power, or of it to him, be instrumentally and dispositively by the peoples act, where they have liberty for such acts.

5. Though it be true, that all Covenants and Contracts amongst men, embodied in a Society, brings each of the contracters under a Law-claim, in case of failing, (*coram Judice proprio*) before his own and competent Judge; yet, it is not true, that any Contracts betwixt man and man in one and the same Society, gives the party keeping contract, coactive Power over the party breaking; it is true, the Judge hath a coactive Power, to lay forth in behalf of the keeper against the breaker, but that is not the keeper his coactive Power, but the Judges employed

employed for his good; the one party is not Judge of the other, but the Magistrate is Judge over both: Now, there is no Judge over all Magistrates, nor the supreme Magistrate, before whom a complaining people can plead wrong done to them: This complaint lyes before God only to take order with it. And it must needs be a strange assertion to say, (as some do) that it leads Kings to Atheisme, to tell them, *They are countable to God only*; whereas this leads them genuinly, to stand in awe of God, and the lesse fear they have from men, to be in greater dreador of more terrible strokes from God, if if they do wrong: ordinarily where there is much fear of mans punishments, there is lesse fear of Gods; but when it is told Princes, the more exemption they have from man, the more terribly will God handle them, if they do wrong, this may make the higheſt and stouteſt hearts, to tremble at the dreadful vengeance, by the hands of the living God, which will strike a deeper stroke then creatures can.

6. To provoke people to go about the medling with the advancing Religion, *actibus Imperatis*, which is the Magistrates part; and not only *actibus elicitis*, is but a ruining of all order God hath set; the imperate acts for advancing Religion, are not to be done, but by these to whom God hath given the Empire: It is not his will, that people run out of their rank and calling to serve him; more then it was his will, that *Saul* or *Vzziah* offered sacrifice or incense; the works were good in themselves, but the workers were not warranded to do the same; extraordinary necessities, are more easily pleaded then justified, as ground sufficient for actions, whereto there is no extraordinary call. If Magistrates be deficient, as to their imperat acts in advancing Religion; private persons are sufficiently discharged, if they keep themselves pure, and do what possibly they can, for advancing Religion in their private capacities, and by their elicit acts: Nor shall they be involved in guiltiness, for not intruding in the Magistrates office, or doing his duty, (wherein he hath failed) If a mans eyes be put out, his ears or other senses, will go as far to supply that defect, for the good of the body as may be, yet, cannot help the body by elicit acts of seeing; So, whatever length private persons may go, for the good of the body, they must not go to exercise and exert formally acts Magistratical, upon whatever pretence of extraordinary need, (which will never be wanting to a people, enflamed with a seditious spirit) *Auguſt. Lib. 2. contra literas Petiliani, Auferenda idola non poteſt quiſpiam jubere privatis.* Lact. *inſtit.* S. 20. *Defendenda eſt Religio, a privatis omnibus non occidendo, ſed moriendo,* &c. It is a dange-

rous

rous and destructive tenent, to be held forth to be believed by people, *That in all cases, whither concerning Religion or Liberty, when they account the Magistrate to pervert the Government, that they are* eatenus, *and so far even as they had no King, and that the royalty hath recurred to themselves, and they may act and exercise it formally as if they had no King at all*; which is the expres Doctrine of *L. R.* p 99. 100. And more intolerable is *Naphtali*, who grants this not only to the body of the people and inferiour Magistrates, but to any the least meer private part of the people, against the whole body, and against all Magistrates supreme and subordinate. Where, or when shall confusions end, if these Doctrines have faith or free passage?

CHAP. IV.

Anent the following of Phineas *fact; of heroick or extraordinary impulsions, and concerning some courses taken at our first Reformation, and their exemplarines.*

THat every man should walk in his own calling with God, 1 *Cor.* 7. 20. and φιλοτιμεῖσθαι πυχάζειν, love the honour to be quiet, and do his own busines, 1 *Thes.* 4. 11. yea, ambitiously contend (as the word bears it) so to do, is agreeable to the mind and will of the God of Order; it is a godly ambition to act within the precincts of our own calling: but Sathan striving to make men ατακτους and ανυποτακτους, disorderly and unsubject to these whom God hath set over them, under several colours, *of extreme necessity, the lawfulnes of the matter of actions in themselves, the goodnes of ends and intentions, the want or deficiency of others to do the work, mens own probable capacity to do it*, doth often drive men out of their ranks and stations, to act such things whereof God will say, *I never required them at your hands; in your hands they are evil*, quia ego non jussi: and becaus sometimes God hath given extraordinary callings, or incited men by his Spirit with heroical motions, to such acts as were not according to ordinary rules of procedure, thence they would bring warrand for their irregularities, and for going out of their line. This vain Orator *Naph.* (p. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25.) catches hold on the instance of *Phineas*, *Numb.* 25. 7, 8. executing justice upon an Israelitish Prince, and will have that a precedent for any private persons (such as lately did rise) under colour of high pitches of zeal and fortitude, whereto they are incited (as he sayes by Gods Spirit) to execute

justice

juſtice upon all the powers and people of the Land, they being fallen in ſuch a fearful apoſtaſie as (keeping the true proteſtant Religion) to vary from them in the external ordering of the Miniſtry of the Church, and embracing that way and order, againſt which there is no command of Chriſt; yea, for the conſonancy whereof to his word, much and very much, may be ſaid and hath been. And although he cannot but ſee the dreadful conſequences of extracting a general rule for theſe times out of ſuch an example, yet, though he turns himſelf *Proteus*-like into many ſhapes, diſtinguiſhing about heroick and extraordinary motions, denying *Phineas* act to be extraordinary, but only heroical, talking much of good intentions, warrandableneſs of the work in it ſelf, deficiency of others in doing it, and of Gods power to give rare heroick incitations, *&c.* he cannot by any thing he ſayes, put a ſufficient bar againſt confuſions under ſuch pretexts, but he opens a door he cannot cloſe again. And the reſult of all is, *to faſten the laſt inſurrection upon the holy ſpirit of God*, to juſtifie their attempts againſt all Authorities in the Land; and to aſſert, they were no more to be condemned as Traitors, then *Phineas* ſhould be for his executing judgement, ſeing they were led with the ſame ſpirit, and had as good warrand as he. And the deſign further is, to inflame people again to the like courſes, under the like pretences, for juſtifying the ſame.

When this mans diſcourſe concerning *Phineas* fact, and the exemplarineſs thereof, and concerning pretended extraordinary or heroick incitations he talkes of, was firſt looked upon; men of any judgement conſider'd, that as the former bloody inſurrections were endeavoured to be juſtified by him, ſo he was laying down grounds for ſome mercileſs maſſacre, or horrid aſſaſſinations on perſons in power, and others (if any people might be found ſo deſerted of God, as to be ſerviceable to him in that wickedneſs) for now no man can have ſecurity of his life, if any private perſons be allowed under *Phineas* cloak to come and cut the throats of all, whom this man will point forth as black Apoſtats, Such deeds muſt be fatherd upon the holy Spirit of God, and his excitations to zeal; which are held a ſufficient calling, though that ſo called zeal, will prove no other but a corrupt luſt, proceeding from another ſpirit. And we muſt forſooth (when theſe men will have us ſo do) own theſe irregularities as being from God, and ſay, *He is employing the weak things and fooliſh of the World to confound the mighty and wiſe, and muſt not condemn them as Uſurpers, or Intruders (although they be but meer private men) more then we would have done* Phineas *in his fact.* Thus he.

What great Villanies have been under such pretences carried on in the world, by persons taking their heroical motions and excitations of zeal, for a sufficient calling to their irregular actions (which is the direct Doctrine of this man) the World knows well. How the *Munster madness* was carried on under extraordinary shewes of zeal, is known, and how also God confounded that way. The murthers of the two Kings *Henries* of *France*, (the third and fourth) have been famous or infamous in this last age, by the cruel hands of two Zelots, inflamed by seditious Predicants and Jesuits, they fell. The assassinates actions were cryed up by such as set them on against these *Nerees* of the time (as these Kings were called by them) as actions most heroically zealous, most *Phineas* like, proceeding not from common vertue or grace, *sed à dono speciali Spiritus Sancti, (proh nefas!)* And they taught, that it was of God to excite these miscreants to cut the Basilick vein (as they spake) to prevent the State and Churches falling into a burning feaver. And to come neerer home, the remembrance of the Gun-powder Traitors, who attempted at one blow to destroy King *James* and all his Family and Parliament, is yet recent: a deed which wanted nothing of the high commendation of an heroical and *Phineas*-like fact (amongst the Zelots of the antichristian party) but that it wanted successe, which marred all. Further, in the time of Queen *Elizabeth* of *England*, *Anno* 1591. Some male-contented Presbyterians, being taken in the head with the same fancy of Heroical motions of zeal, as a sufficient calling to attempt something beyond rule, in the desolate and colapsed estate of the Church (as they call'd it) began first to question and propose it as a case of conscience, *If in such a case, God might not give such high measures of zeal, fortitude, courage and rare excitations of his Spirit to meer private persons against oppressing powers, which might be a sufficient call to attempt somewhat against Magistrates, not suiting ordinarily rules, and committing the event to God.* The men were, *Arthington*, *Coppinger*, and *Hacket* the chief of the three, as they were all marvelous zealous for the discipline; So this third having debauched his estate, surpassed in zeal this way (perhaps looking for some reparation by it) and was, (as the History tells us) a man of highest pretences of the internal unction of spirituality and of pure zeal, and one who could *ex tempore* pray to admiration. The godly Ministers, who were of their perswasion in matters of discipline, for the most part disliked, and disswaded them from their course (albeit some too furious entertained and encouraged them.) After this, they went to action; *Hackets* two complices went

to

to the most open and publick streets of the City of *London*, declaring to them, that *Hacket* (who was to be found at his lodging, in one Mr. *Walkers* in *Cripple-gate*) was sent of God, to represent Jesus Christ on earth, with his fan in his hand, to separate the pretious from the vile and to erect the holy discipline in all *Europe*; they having a great concourse of people flocking about them, declared themselves to be his extraordinary Prophets, the one to preach vengeance to them, who would not obey them; the other to preach mercy to all, who would obey them. And in the great concourse of people, they ceased not to cry, repent, repent, O *England*! and embrace the Gospel, and opportunity of Reformation. As for the Queen, they cried she had fallen from her right to the Kingdom; And that most of her Councellours, were but betrayers of the Kingdom. And all their doctrines they set forth, with terrible imprecations against themselves, if they spake not truth.

The Queen being at *Greenwich*, and hearing of the uproar at *London*, sent two of her Councellors to see what the matter was; the deceivers all three were apprehended and arraigned, as stirring up sedition against the Queen, and designing to destroy her, to murther her Councellors and Bishops, to bring in their new King, and trans-form all things in Church and State, to their own fancies. *Hacket* the King was executed, and dyed blaspheming. *Coppinger* in a fury pining himself with hunger, at last beat his own brains against the wall and dyed. *Arthington*, upon his repentance, obtained mercy of the Queen.

Such abominable courses carried on, under pretext of Heroick motions, and rare excitations of the Spirit, should make the fearers of God, very cautelous against the Principles of this man, which lead this way; For he asserts, *There needs no standing upon an external call, if men think they have this internal call, to use the Sword for vengeance against Apostate Magistrates* (all and sundry) *such as he reckons they are in this time*, (Napht. p. 24.) Any party of private men, may (according to his mind) rise up in a *Phineas like fortitude against not only Princes, but all the* Primores Regni, *becoming Patrons of abominations, to execute Judgement upon them*, (Napht. p. 22.) *and to reform an Apostate Church, their zeal, &c. is a sufficient call without further.* If such Doctrines passe for current and good coine, and if our people be so principled, it were better living under the great Turk, where no man is to loose his life but by Law, then in *Scotland*; where all Magistrates and others, shall be proclaimed lyable to the fury of any private persons, who can pretend rare and Heroick

excitations of the Spirit, to zealous executing justice upon men, whenever they, thus animated, think there is cause: For, this man proclaims these inward excitations, as a sufficient call, without any other external call.

But this man, seing the mischief of his evil Doctrine, (though he is loath to part with it) would gladly add some Salvo, if he could: for saith he, p. 24. *We held not such instances,* (viz. as that of Phineas) *as regular Precedents for all times and persons universally.* That is well said, but where is the caution that is put in against any, that will pretend Heroical excitations by the Spirit, as a sufficient call: He hath opened a door, but how will he close it again. It is easie to raise the Devil, but not so easie to lay him again; the man would say something to satisfaction, if he could set down certain rules, to bar a heady people, under a pretence of *Phineas*-like motions and excitations, to arise upon every occasion to confound all: But, as he cannot do this, so doth he not attempt it; he cannot give any remedy against confusion in all cases, having proclaimed this libertinisme to private persons, upon pretence of Heroick excitations of zeal, *&c.* to rise up against all Powers above them; for they are made Judges (in their own private discretion) when it is fit to fall in hand with such irregular practices: And when it is, that such Heroick excitations are upon their Spirits; and when it is, that matters are so far out of order, that they cannot be amended, without their violent interposing and pulling down of Powers: all this, is referred to private persons private discretion; and if this mans party were posessed in Power, upon their principles, another party, perhaps of *Quakers, Ranters,* &c. could easily start up, and plead their impulses from above, to rectifie the corrupted and collapsed estate of affairs, and to reform and punish offenders; So, there shall be no end of confusion, when these are got into the saddle, others shall met to them in that same measure, *erranti nullus terminus,* there shall be a progress to confusion *in infinitum.* And never shall people, (when they mind changes) want the pretexts of corruption in Rulers, and in all besides themselves, and will lay hold on any probable capacity, which qualifies them for exercise of Justice against all, not of their way. And although they be not in probable capacity, to take the fields, or leavy Armies; yet, they will go so far in executing justice upon all Magistrates, (*Phineas*-like) as upon *patronisers* (p. 24.) *of abominations,* (as he sayes, all our Magistrates of all degrees are now) for he tells us (p. 18.) *They ought without doubt, be suppressed by all meanes,* (*n. b.* by all meanes) if there be no probable capacity for armies,

armies, a dag or a dagger, a piſtol or poiſoned poinard, a Spaniſh-fig, or ſome ſecret applications may do the buſineſs, with ſome great ones: And any Heroick Saint, may be in probable capacity for ſuch matters, (theſe are amongſt the generality of any means uſable, for ſuppreſſing Powers) it is all one matter, if Juſtice be execute and the evil removed, whatever way, it is all one as if *Phineas* did it with his Javelin, and God ſhould be praiſed, when juſtice is executed on adverſaries, an apoſtat Church (ſuch as now is) reformed. Of this no more ſhall be ſaid; But we are to pray, that the life of our dread Soveraign may be bound up with the Lord his God in the bundle of Life; and alſo, that the ſame great and good God, may be a ſhield and buckler to his ſervants, (who deſire in honouring the King, to fear him, the King of Kings above all) againſt the generation of men of blood and violence, who bewray their ungodlineſs too much, in daring to ſeek patrociny for villanous aſſaſſinations from the holy Scriptures of God.

But behold, how the man wrings his wit, to work out (*Naphtal.* pag. 21, 23, 24, 25.) an Apologie for the ſeditions from *Phineas* example; he tells us, *Phineas was but a private man, that he had no extraordinary calling to execute judgement, only he had heroical motions, and zealous excitations to it, and that God who is the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever, and hath the reſidue and plenty of his Spirit, to pour out upon meer private perſons, may by giving them ſuch or the ſame Spirit of zeal, magnaminity and courage, ſufficiently call them by his breathings upon them, to execute juſtice on adverſaries, and to reform an apoſtate Church*, &c. *and when it is ſo, we ſhould not condemn, but honour Gods inſtruments; for, if they did not ſtep in to act, impiety would quickly gaine an univerſal empire to the extermination of all goodneſs.* To all which we ſay,

1. As to the perſon *Phineas*, (from whoſe actings Patrociny is ſought, for juſtifying the violence of private perſons againſt the Magiſtrate and their uſurping over him as Judges, to puniſh him) it is much doubted, if he was a meer private perſon he was the high Prieſts ſon, a chief Prieſt himſelf, and afterward he became high Prieſt himſelf, he was a ſingular perſon and a Prince in his tribe, employed with other Princes by Gods people, in great Embaſſages both in Peace and in War, *Numb.* 31. 6. *Joſh.* 22. 31. 32. he was one of the great Council of the people, of the heads or rulers, and famous men amongſt them, (*called the congregation, or the renowned of the congregation*, Numb. 1. 16. 16. 2.) who did, in that diſmal time, wherein ſo much ſin did break

break forth, and so much wrath from the Lord attending sin, meet with *Moses* the chief Magistrate, *Numb.* 25. 6. to lament the abominable idolatry and bodily filthiness, committed at that time, and to consult and advise, about the authoritative restraining of this wickedness: In the mean time, when the great Council are humbled before the Lord, for the common wickedness, and for the wrath that was upon them, *Zimri*, a Prince of *Simeon*, with his *Midianitish* woman, are in their very sight going into the Prince of *Israels* tent; and *Josephus* tells us, that before *Moses* and the Council he justified the fact, and pleaded frowardly to have and retain her. In this case of so effronted wickedness, *Phineas* then one of the congregation or great Council, 7. ver. *Rose from amongst the congregation*, (or great Council, which shews, he was sitting amongst them) and under the eye and knowledge and approbation of *Moses*, the supreme Magistrate, pursued them both to the tent, executing judgement on them, and thrusting them through. The words of *Diodat* on ver. 8. are, *That this was an act of extraordinary zeal and motion of Gods Spirit, in a cruel and fierce delict, which was approved in* Phineas *by God, after the act was done*: *And* (n. b.) *by* Moses *the supreme Magistrate, the execution being done under his eyes and known of him*; Thus Diodat. To this purpose Aquinas, 2ª 2ª. *quest.* 60. *Art.* 6. where he disputes, *Utrum Judicium reddator perversum per usurpationem*, Resolves, *That judgement cannot be execute upon any without publick Authority, more then a Law can be made without publick Authority*; and speaking of the fact of *Phineas*, he sayes, *He did this by divine inspiration, being moved with the zeal of God*: and adds, *Albeit he was not the high Priest, yet he was the Son of the high Priest; and the executing of judgement belonged to him as to other Judges, to whom that was commanded of God.* Gerhard, de Magistratu, P. 841. Phineas *non fuit omnino privata persona*, he was one of the *chief Priests*, who as *Aarons* rod tells us, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. *had equal power with all other members, both in decrees and executions of judgments.* So that he (in all probability) being no meer private person, and doing what he did, with approbation of the Soveraign Magistrate, it is a very weak argument that is brought from him, to enstate any private persons in a power of executing judgement.

2. Suppose *Phineas* to have been a meer private person; yet, seing he did this act under the eye and presence, with the approbation and good-liking of *Moses* (as *Diodat* rationally saith) and of the great Council there assembled, and he is to be looked upon as the executor of

their

their unanimous sentence against effronted villany: As at another time, *Exod.* 32. 27, 28. *Moses*, as Gods Vice-gerent, set the Levits and others on work to execute judgment by the sword upon an idolatrous people; in which case they were *satellites Magistratus*, and had his Commission: and why might not *Phineas* have here the like warrand from *Moses*? If any say, it is not written; it may be answered, *In rebus facti à non scripto ad non factum non valet consequentia*; all things done are not written. We have heard famous Authors accounting him to have had warrand, whether as a Judge or Executor of the will of the great Council and of *Moses*, who did well approve his deed. But, how absurd is it to bring an argument from this instance, to warrand any private man to do justice when he thinks there is need, not only without the Magistrates consent, but even upon all Magistrates, supreme and subordinate? which is the scope this mans writing drives at.

3. The case wherein *Phineas* executed judgement, was when horrible idolatry and villanous whoredom was avowedly, and with an high hand, committed in the sight of the Sun; and in way of open doing despite to God and to all Magistrates, and the supreme Council then assembled to mourn before God, and to take course for remedying by their Authority, the horrible looseness broken forth at that time. But, dare this man say, that there is now such horrid wickedness? although he is bold to call all the Magistrates, supreme and subordinate, *Patrons of abominations*, and *men acting in the meer spirit of wickedness*: while the true Protestant Religion, according to the Scriptures and the Laws at our first Reformation, and Confession of Faith, recorded in Parliament, is sincerely and constantly held. There is a change and regulation of the exterior form of Church-government, anent which godly men differ, and the change that is made will be maintained against this man, to contain nothing contrary to Gods Word. Yet, forsooth, this is the great abomination and so gross, that it may licence every private person to rise up against all Magistrates, supreme and subordinate, to depose them or cut their throats; and this must be called executing judgement for the Lord, and a *Phineas*-like fact.

4. Let it be so, that *Phineas* was a meer private man, and had no warrand from the supreme Magistrate to do what he did (which yet cannot be proved) his fact can be no warrand for private men to attempt the doing of such acts; unless they can shew as good warrand and approbation from God, as he could. God, who is the Lord of all Magistrates and of all mens lives, can (when it pleaseth him) cross ordinary rules, and can appoint some to execute his judgements extraordinarily;

ordinarily; wherein they are not to be followed by such as have not the same spirit, the same warrand and command, or commission. He may send *Moses* to kill the Egyptian, *Eglon* to kill *Ehud*, *Elias* to destroy companies of men with fire from Heaven, or to kill *Baals* Priests (an instance which it is strange the Libeller omitted, seing it is the ordinary dialect of the Faction, as may be seen in the *Apology* and elsewhere, to call (most wickedly) all Church-men dissenting from their way, *Baals* Priests) God may command *Abraham* to kill his Son *Isaac*, he may excite *David* to a bloody duel, and *Samson* to murther himself with others: so also might he stir up *Phineas* (though a private man) to execute judgement: but, 1. he had the motion and direction of Gods Spirit setting him on to that work; such motions were *loco specialis mandati*, as Divines speak; and *Calvin*, *Ps.* 106. speaking of this same fact, saith, he had *singularis & extraordinarius motus qui ad communem regulam exigi non debet*. And when he hath compared *Moses* killing the Egyptian with this fact of *Phineas*, he saith, *Talis fuit impulsus in* Phinea, *nam etsi nemo putabat gladio Dei esse armatum, ipse tamen potestatis divinitus concessæ probe sibi conscius fuit*. *Augustin*, speaking of *Samson*, *lib.* 2. *de civit. Dei*, *c.* 21. *Nec* Samson, saith he, *aliter excusatur quod seipsum cum hostibus ruina domus oppressit, nisi quod latenter Spiritus sanctus hoc jusserat*. So he is accounted amongst heroick Believers, *Heb.* 11. 32. And of his fact, *Bernard* saith, *lib. de precept. & dispensatione*; *Si defenditur non fuisse peccatum, privatum habuisse à Deo consilium indubitanter credendum est*. 2. *Phineas* had not only a large reward of his fact, *Numb.* 25. 12, 13. but an ample approbation of it, *Ps.* 106. 31. *It was accounted to him for righteousness, i. e.* as a righteous action, both as to the intention of it (Gods honour) and as to the ground and warrand of it (Gods direction.) God does not approve or remunerate any action, which one way or another he doth not command: there are none of these extraordinary actions mentioned in Scripture, but either Gods stirring men up to the same, or his approbation of the same, one way or another is noted; See *Judg.* 3. 10. and, 5. 7. and, 10. 23. and, 3. 9. 15. and, 2. 16. 18. *he raised up, stirred up mens spirits*, or afterward approved them expresly in these actions. As for the private persons, which this man will have to take the punishing Sword in their hand against all Magistrates, as they cannot pretend extraordinary special commands; So the real rebukes of God given them, proclaims they have not his approbation.

5. Divines have given it as a good rule, *Opera liberi spiritus non sunt*

sunt exigenda ad regulas communes, nec trahenda in exemplum vitæ. If once men come to make rules of the actions specially warranded beyond the common rule of the Word, where will they stand? As to instance this same example of *Phineas*. If they will go on to presse the imitation of it, 1. They must say, that even when the Magistrate is godly and zealous and willing to execute judgement (as *Moses*, and the great Council were) private persons may do it without them, and not wait their warrand, as they think *Phineas* did not. 2. That any private person may go to mens Tents or Chambers, and stab them without any legal Processe (which *Phineas*, they will say, used not.) 3. That if such things be done *inconsulto pro Magistratu* (such as *Moses* was) yet the doer must not be challenged, as *Phineas* was not challenged by *Moses*.

6. The Libeller, striving to parallel the Acts of his party, (which he justifies and incites unto) with *Phineas* his act, as he dare not say the acts which he justifies and instigates unto are extraordinary, but only heroical; so he asserts *Phineas* act was not extraordinary, nor upon extraordinary warrant, but heroical and imitable by others, who may have such measures of zeal as he had. He should in order to this, laboured to have set some distinction betwixt heroical and extraordinary acts, but this he doth not, only labours to jumble the matter, and speaks so confusedly, that as others cannot understand him, so he gives evidence he did not understand himself in this matter; only something he would gladly say to encourage men to irregular actions, under the pretence of *Phineas* fact. But the man, if he would, might have known the distinction betwixt extraordinary and heroical acts. Philosophers and Divines too, distinguish betwixt heroical vertues with the acts suitably thereto, and common vertues and their acts, (3ª *pars Thomæ, qu.* 7 *art.* 2ª *ad* 2ᵐ) and aggree in this, that there is no difference between heroical vertues and *virtutes communiter dictæ, nisi secundum perfectiorem modum.* A heroick act doth not deviate from the rule of a common vertue, but only proceeds from a more intense disposition to a high pitch of vertue, and of the acts thereof, but yet keeps within the bounds of the ordinary rule of such or such a vertuous action. But, an extraordinary action goes beyond any ordinary rule of common reason or divine Word; as, that *Abraham* should kill *Isaac* without any hatred of him, or cause in him, was an act of extraordinary obedience to a special mandate of God. Albeit the love that is due to God above all, and the respect due to his Soveraignty, should incline to obey whatever he enjoyns: yet, the particular act of slaying his harmlesse child, meerly

upon the declared will of God, was an extraordinary act of obedience, not compriſable within the liſts of common vertues, that direct our actings toward men under God. Extraordinary actions are ſuch as are done upon ſpecial mandate of God, and are not within the compaſſe of ordinary acts of obedience according to the rule that is ſet. Men may have heroick motions and actions within the bounds of an ordinary calling, as ſometimes, though they have extraordinary calling, they may want heroical motions. *Luther* had no immediate nor extraordinary calling to reform the Church; but within the bounds of ordinary calling, he had ſpecial excitations of Gods Spirit, and was elevated unto heroick actings for Gods glory, in an exceedingly corrupt and collapſed ſtate of the Church. *Peter* had an extraordinary calling and immediate, yet he wanted ſometimes heroical motions and actions, as when he diſſembled, *Gal.* 2. *Phineas* had not only excitations of zeal and heroical motions, but (ſuppoſing him a meer private Perſon) he is to be looked upon, as having extraordinary calling from God, which is fully enough inſinuated, both by Gods approving and rewarding him, *Numb.* 25. (and he rewards not our will-ſervice, nor approves it, but what he hath enjoyned himſelf) and alſo by *Pſ.* 106. where it is ſaid emphatically, *it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs*, though judging according to ordinary rules, it might be imputed to him for ſin (ſuppoſing him a meer private man.) Yet, having Gods warrand, whoſe will is the rule of righteouſneſs, the deed was imputed to him for righteouſneſs.

7. Great gifts, ſecret impulſes, heroical motions, do not (as this man ſuggeſts) give men ſufficient call to go beyond the ordinary rules God hath ſet to men in their callings (though they diſpoſe them to act eminently in their callings) yet cannot give a new or another calling. Every calling a man hath to any work God ſets him about, muſt be either mediate or immediate (there is no midſt betwixt theſe two, as there is not between contradictories.) If men be not called to a work by the intervention of men, and their allowance, they muſt plead an immediate calling from God. And we would gladly hear, if this man will allow the private perſons, whom he inſtigates to inſurrections againſt Magiſtrates, an immediate calling (by vertue of their ſecret impulſes and excitations) for we are ſure, they have no mediate ordinary calling. If he will go on to ſay, that great gifts of zeal, *&c.* great excitations and impulſes, allows people to deſert their own calling and ſtate, (like theſe ſpirits, *Jude 6. that kept not their firſt eſtate, but left their own habitation*) and to intrude upon the Magiſtrates office alwayes, when they think there is cauſe, without an external

ternal vocation from men. Where will he reſt, till he confound all within Church and State? If ſuch gifts and impulſes be ſufficient call for intruding in the office of the Magiſtrate to execute juſtice, why is it not alſo ſufficient for the office of the Miniſtry, without call from men externally? And thus Anabaptiſts, Enthuſiaſts, Photinians and the like, denying the neceſſity of external call to the Miniſtry; avowing gifts and exeitations to be a ſufficient call, ſhall gain the day; a man may take the honour of a Miniſtry to himſelf, without waiting mans call, as well as the honour of Magiſtracy: a ſelf-called-Magiſtrate, and a ſelf-called Miniſter, are very ſib together. And how ſhall the Libeller refuſe to admit women to baptize children in caſe of neceſſity? (the thing it ſelf being good and for a good end, and there being none other to do it, and the exigence great) or how will he hold back any private perſons from preaching and miniſtring all Sacraments, though they have no external call? It is eaſie to pretend as great need for this, as for intruding into the Magiſtrates office.

8. It is in vain for this man to tell us, *that Gods hand is not ſhortened, and he hath plenty of the Spirit to give, and is the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever, and can give ſuch gifts and excitations and ſuch allowance in acting, as* Phineas *had.* For our queſtion is not anent Gods power, or what he may do; (we adore that glorious Majeſty, who doth what he will in heaven and in earth, and can do above all we can think) But our queſtion is, if now, after that the Canon of holy Scripture is perfected, ſealed and conſigned, we have warrand to look for any extraordinary perſons, having Gods ſecret and ſpecial mandates to do works, which any ordinary calling they have by allowance and approbation of men, according to the rules of common reaſon and the word, doth not intereſt them in, ſuch as *Phineas* act (ſuppoſing him a private man) is to be eſteemed.

The man falls out in wiſhing, *that all Gods people were as* Phineas, *and had the ſame Spirit of holy Zeal; that by removal of the cauſe, his fierce anger againſt this poor Land might ceaſe:* We ſhall eaſily concur with him, in wiſhing and praying that Gods people may be filled with zeal to his Glory, as *Phineas* was; but not that they ſhould have that ſame exerciſe of zeal that he had, nor follow his fact, unleſſe they could be certified of their warrand and calling to do ſo, as he was. The Apoſtles of Chriſt, are to us examples of zeal for God in their Miniſtery; but, who will ſay, that the acts which they zealouſly did, by vertue of their extraordinary calling, are for our imitation, albeit their zeal be? *Peter* in zeal to Gods honour, killed

Ananias and *Saphira*, who lied to the holy Ghost; Shall therefore Ministers slay men that deal deceitfully with God, or shed their blood? the zeal was imitable, but not the fact; the fact is not justified, meerly by the zeal that puts on to it, but by the calling and warrand. To follow all the facts of them, who have been truly zealous for God, is indeed a ζηλοξηλια, an evil zeal, like the zeal of the disciples, *Luke* 9. 54. *Who knew not of what Spirit they were. Peter Martyrs* word, speaking of imitation of extraordinary examples of zeal and facts done that way, *Loc. comm. Class.* 2. *cap.* 9. is good, *Nobis cavendum est ne illa quæ vehementer & extraordinarie cupimus aliquo exemplo Majorum velimus constabilire, cum inusitata volumus aggredi contra ordinaria Dei præcepta, non est satis exempla produxisse Majorum, sed excutiendus Spiritus quo ducimur, ne specioso quodam prætextu carnis affectum & prudentiam sequamur.* And *Perkins* on the Creed, pag. 194. sayes well. *If a man be zealous for Christ, he must be zealous within the compasse of his Calling; and not be zealous first, and then look for a Calling: but first look for a Calling, and then be zealous: Which thing, if* Peter *had marked, he would not have dealt so rashly in drawing his sword and smitting; for, being without compass of his Calling, he could not but do amisse*: But, yet this man urgeth (*Nap. p.* 24) *impiety shall quickly gain an universal Empire, to the extermination of all goodness; if for fear of accidental hazards, vertue and vertuous actions of private persons, shall be utterly neglected. Ans.* None offers to hinder vertue and vertuous actions of private persons, but only their vitious usurpations upon the Magistrate; no evil should be done, either that good may come of it, or a worse evil prevented; the exercise of the Magistrates office in executing judgement is good, being done by him, but it is evil, being done by a private person, that hath no calling so to do; every man hath not a calling to do all good, but only that good which is competent to him in his calling to do: when iniquity is like to prevail, it is my part, who am a private person to mourn for it, to pray against it, to use fraternal loving warnings to others as I have occasion, and to keep my self pure from pollutions; in so doing, I may sit down with contentment, referring the remedy of evils to God in his own way and time; but, to break Gods order, by intruding into publick places and the actions of Magistrates, for preventing or remedying impiety, is but to cure one sin by another. And when we have invaded the Magistrates place, being private persons, others will do the like to us, and there shall be no end of confusion; Fearers of God, would not listen to the charmes of vain talkers; but, be-

beware of removing the ancient limits God hath ſet of mens callings, were it, for prevention of greateſt idolatry or wickedneſs, nothing that is either evil in it ſelf, or evil as circumſtantiated in our hands, from whom God hath required no ſuch thing, is to be done; *Will ye ſpeak wickedly for God, and talk deceitfully for him?* Job. 13. 7. But this Libeller inſiſts upon the matter of private mens uſurping the Magiſtrates place, not only in the firſt part of his Book, ſpeaking in reference to our firſt Reformation and Way of it, which he brings to juſtifie preſent inſurrections; but in the latter part, p. 151. 152. he will have private men taking the puniſhing and reforming ſword in their hands againſt all Magiſtrates, and ſayes expreſly, *people of inferior degree, may ſtep forward to occupy the places and aſſert the intereſts, which wicked Rulers have forfeited and deſerted*; *And this*, he ſayes, *is according to the Covenant, where they ſwear in their places and callings, to endeavour reformation*, &c. *which clauſe*, (he ſayes) *is to be taken, not reſtrictively, but* (as he ſpeaks) *the clauſe is exegetick and ampliative, and that the ſenſe is, that if others in their reſpective places, concur in advancing the work, every one ſhall confine himſelf to his own place and calling; but if theſe in higher employment fail in their oath, it is the place and calling of private perſons to reform or remove them, and ſtep in and occupy their places.* Thus the profane Juglar, (if he will deſervedly take the ſtile, which he undeſervedly gives his oppoſites, p. 54) makes a Welch-mans hoſe of the words of the Covenant, to provoke people to intruſion in the Magiſtrates office. Who ever heard of ſuch a thing, that theſe words (*in our places and callings*) do not reſtrict private mens endeavours to wayes fit for their places and callings? What a ſtrange exigeſis or explication, (as he calls it) is that of our endeavours in our places and callings to reform, *i. e. That we ſhall go out of our places and callings, to reform? and being private men, ſhall occupy the Magiſtrates place and remove him and puniſh him*; *or, that private men only did ſwear conditionally to act in their places and callings, ſo long as they in eminency acted in their places and callings for Religion, with a reſerve, to run out of our places and callings, when they deſerted and abuſed theirs?* What Jeſuitical jugling, in the matter of the Oath, is this? This is a new diſcovery this man hath given us, of the deceitful ambiguities of the Covenant, to help us out of love with it. *The words* (ſaith he) *are exegetick, and ampliative*; exegetick thus, *I ſwear in my calling and place, all dayes of my life to endeavour*, &c. *i. e.* When I ſee cauſe, I ſwear, I ſhall flee out of my place.

and

and calling, to do so good a work, and will not be restricted to it. But how are they ampliative, the vain Orator would tell us? Are the words that bind to do in our places and callings obliegeing to a duty, more amply and extensively then they import? *viz.* That we should stretch our selves beyond our line, and intrude in places God hath not called us unto. How intolerable is this abuse offered to the Covenant and Gods people too, in such vain and senseless glosses?

O! But he builds much upon the practice of our first Reformers, and *Phineas* fact must justifie that, and that must justifie all modern insurrections. As to the work of Reformation of Religion, at first in this Land, it is our desire to speak honourably of it, so far as we can with truth. Blessed be God for that great work of bringing in his Truth amongst us, and delivering us from the dark and miserable bondage of antichristian Tyranny; and he who delivered us, keep us from returning to that house of Egyptian bondage: But we cannot (holding to the truth) justifie all courses that were used then for carrying on the work of Reformation; neither are we much concerned so to do. If some instruments thereof were guilty of sedition or sacriledge, or self-seeking, (while the work of God was in hands) what is that to us, who own the result of the work as good, great and glorious, through the Lords marvelous operation? If sinful courses were then used by men, the mercy of God, in the result of the work, was to us the more marvelous, and the fuller of glorious Grace, that God did not, for the disorders of instruments, disappoint the work, and leave us destitute of the Gospel-light. We may say, as the blind man in the Gospel who had his eyes opened, said, *Whether he was a sinner that opened his eyes or not, he knew not: but this he knew, that whereas he was blind, now he did see*, Joh. 9. 25. So, whither they who were instrumental in our Reformation, sinned in their way or not, we are not much concerned to enquire: But we know, that through Gods good guiding, a merciful work, in the result was wrought to them and to us, which work we own and cleave to, and will (through grace) do so to the end; it is an ordinary matter for the all-wise providence of God, to bring forth, out of mens dark and disorderly actings, great works of light and order. The Saviour of the world was crucified by wicked hands; yet, the result was the redemption of the world. How many Ministers go to hell, for their unsincere handling of Gods Word, and miscarriages in their life; yet, God makes use of his own Ordinance in their hands, to bring Souls to Heaven, notwithstanding of their corrupt manner of dealing in his holy things. A leprous hand

may

may ſow good ſeed, but he were a fool of the firſt magnitude, who would either make a panegyrick in praiſe of a leprous hand, or perſwade all that ſow good ſeed to have ſuch hands. Heirs of glory may be gotten in baſtardy, or fornication and adultery; and yet theſe are not good, but evil. Let God be glorified, who in his wiſdom brings order out of confuſion, and light out of darkneſs. But, let us not ſtand ſuperſtitiouſly upon the juſtifying of all their deeds that went before us; nor indeavour to imitate and follow the ſame, further then they are according to Gods mind. *Be ye not as your fathers*, is a good rule when fathers fall off and deviate from the rule of God's will: we are not to live by examples, but by precepts; and if we will look to examples, we want not theſe of the primitive Chriſtians to ſet before us, whoſe practices in bringing in Religion into the world, (wherein they never uſed any undutiful reſiſtance to, or violence upon Magiſtrates) is more regardable by us, then any precedents in theſe dregs of time, and in the end of this corrupt world. Some have ſaid, Religion would never have been reformed, if violence had not been uſed upon Magiſtrates: but, why ſhould men take on them to limite God? Hath he not ſhewed his power in ſeveral parts of the world, in working on the hearts of ſupreme Magiſtrates, and cauſing them to go before others in reformation of abuſes? and could he not ſo do alſo elſewhere, without the aid of popular tumults, which are but evil examples to the poſterity? But men are too apt to be bold in ante-verting Gods way, and to follow their own carnal prudence and affections in that which they are ſet upon, and thereupon (when they proſper) to fancy a divine approbation of their way: ſo ſelf-loving are men ordinarily. But, let it be ſo, that much of the way of theſe who were at firſt inſtrumental in the Reformation in this Land, were juſtifiable upon the account of purging the Church from the horrid groſsneſs of idolatry, corruption of doctrine, tyranny and uſurpation over poor Souls, wherewith the man of ſin had for many ages, defiled and burthened the poor Church; and upon the account of the open hoſtility to the Truth, wherein Magiſtrates then ſtood, together with the inbringing of forraign furious forces upon us, even to the heart of our Land. How unlike was the caſe then to what it is now? And how unable is the caſe now to bear the burthen of a concluſion for ſuch practices as then were uſed? Seing we can avow it, in the preſence of God, that we contend for that ſame Faith and Religion, that our Predeceſſors ſtood for againſt the powers of that time; and will maintain the ſame againſt all Novators, who upon account of a piece of Church-order,

(allowed

allowed by our Reformers) now re-established, instigate any private persons, who have power enough, to destroy all Magistracy and Order in the Land, because of the owning thereof; and to occupy their rooms; (as *N.* clearly doth) And then, forsooth, this man and his complices shall be in their places and callings, according to the Covenant, (as he expones it) when they get in to the Chair of Government, and all our Nobles and Magistrates driven into corners, or made to lacky these purely mortified States-men. In the *Pittland-hill* business, an Essay for this was made, but the party *magnis excidit ausis*. They had thoughts to repair their losses, and to make themselves rich by a pure Reformation, getting all the interests of the Kingdom at one clap into their hands, (though perhaps they would have forced us to believe, that all their external gains had been but accidental consequences of their heavenly designe.) But God rolled out of the way such a stumbling and snare to many, which might have arisen from their success; it was *infelix scelus*, and so escaped the reputation of a Vertue, and of an heroical Exploit.

FINIS.

3 2 1810